# Doctrine and Defense.

## Theological and ecclesiastical contemporary history

# Monthly Bulletin

**Published**

**by the**

**German Ev.-Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio u. a. St.**

**Edited by**

**St. Louis Seminary faculty.**

Luther: "A preacher must not only feed, so that he instructs the sheep how they should be true Christians, but also ward off the wolves, so that they do not attack the sheep and lead them astray with false teaching and introduce error, as the devil does not rest. Now many people can be found who are willing that the gospel should be preached, if only one does not cry out against the wolves and preach against the prelates. But though I preach rightly, and feed and teach the sheep well, yet it is not enough to keep the sheep, and to keep them, lest the wolves come and lead them away again. For what is it built, if I cast up stones, and I see another cast them in again? The wolf may well suffer the sheep to have good pasture; he loveth them the better that they find feist; but this he cannot suffer, that the dogs bark in

---

**Fifty-sixth volume.**

**St. Louis, Mo.**

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.

1910.

# Content.


January. Page

Preface ... 1
"Luther's Newly Discovered Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans from 1515/16".... ... 14
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 39

February.

The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53 ... 49
Use of the expressions καλεῖν, κλήσις, κλητός in the New Testament ... 55
What we teach of the election of grace ... 65
Miscellaneous ... 67
Literature ... 70
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 80

March.

The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53 ... 97
Use of the Expressions καλεῖν, κλήσις, κλητός in the New Testament ... 106
Miscellaneous ... 120
Literature ... 122
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 125

April.

The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53 ... 145
The "condemnation sentences" of the Athanasian Symbolum ... 154
Literature ... 176
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 183

May.

The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53 ... 193
Luther's death ... 202
Literature ... 219
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 225

June.

The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53 ... 241
Pelagius ... 252
What does Scripture teach about the soul? ... 262
Literature... 276
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 279

July. **Page**

Did Luther mutilate the Bible? ... 289
The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church ... 302
Mas does Scripture teach of the soul? ... 308
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 315

August.

The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church ... 337
The Means of Grace according to the Presbyterian Confession ... 344
Literature ... 365
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 371

September.

On the history of infant baptism ... 385
The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church ... 394
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 409

October.

Illumination of the Norwegian Unification Theses ... 433
Literature ... 466
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 469

November.

Our hymnal ... 481
A supplement to the explanation of Rom. 5, 19 ... 501
Literature ... 506
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 513

December.

Another word about the nature of faith ... 529
The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church ... 542
On the history of infant baptism ... 550
Literature ... 558
Ecclesiastical and contemporary history ... 560

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56.** **January 1910.** **No. 1.**

## Preface.

When a hiker has covered a long distance, he stops for a while and looks back at the landscape he has passed through. And so, as we enter a new decade, it is appropriate for this magazine of ours to take a look back, a look back at the past decades. One usually calculates a human age as thirty years. And it is exactly thirty years since the signal was given for a general attack on the doctrinal position of our Synod, that the so-called Dispute over the Doctrine of Election by Grace took its beginning, which led to other serious doctrinal battles and whose consequences continue to have an effect down to our own day. Naturally, our theological journal has taken part in this theological and ecclesiastical movement and, for its part, has testified to and upheld the old Lutheran truth in the face of later deviations and the latest attacks. And so a brief recollection of the last thirty years of work of "Lehre und Wehre" might seem quite timely.

In the years 1880-1909 the most diverse topics of dogmatic, exegetical, dogma-historical, symbolic, church-historical, and also practical content have been treated. The "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliche" has presented the most important ecclesiastical events to our readers and put them in perspective. From these shorter or longer notes, one could well produce a fairly complete church history of recent times. But in the articles section, too, questions of the times have been discussed, and often in great detail. And the most burning questions of the day for us were precisely those that led to a battle that was fought out not only in church journals, but also at synods, conferences, and congregational meetings, and resulted in regrettable divisions. It was mostly our former friends and confederates who stood up against us, accused us and our fellow believers in the Synodal Conference of false doctrine, even of apostasy from Lutheranism.

and thus forced us to defend our position. In this struggle, which was certainly under divine providence, we gained the advantage of recognizing the old truth ever more clearly and becoming ever more certain of it. The apologetic and polemical articles in "Lehre und Wehre" bear witness to this.

The doctrinal struggle of the past decades concerned articles of Christian doctrine which belong to soteriology, that is, which relate directly to salvation and the way of salvation. First, as already noted, the doctrine of election by grace. Blessed D. Walther had concluded a lengthy series of theses on the noblest doctrines of the Lutheran Church, which had been ventilated for years at synods, with a double paper on the election of grace. These two synodal reports, of 1877 and 1879, met with opposition and the objectors more or less appendix. AS the clamor of the Calvinism or Cryptocalvinism of the Missourians and their co-religionists was spread throughout the ecclesiastical world, we were confronted with the decision whether to divulge, or rather to limit, to soften our position, or to hold fast the truth we had discerned, without clauses. These were uplifting moments, or, to use an expression of which the aged president of the Norwegian Synod availed himself in public assembly, "moments of eternal significance," when, in 1881, the assembled Missouri Synod at Fort Wayne agreed upon the well-known 13 propositions of D. Walther, the assembled Wisconsin Synod at La Crosse to D. Hönecke's debate on the election of grace, the Synodical Conference at Chicago to both testimonies with one accord, while the previous opponents persisted in their opposition. The **status controversiae** was, and is, whether faith flows from election, or election from faith; or, in other words, whether our salvation stands with God alone, or depends in some measure also on man. And this **status controversiae** has then been clarified on all sides and directions in many writings and counter-writings, and so also in "Lehre und Wehre", in the years 1880-1883. We taught and teach that our election has no cause in us, in man, but is founded solely in God's mercy and Christ's merit, that the eternal election of God, not the so-called election of grace in the broader sense, but precisely the election which alone passes over the children of God, is a cause of our blessedness and all that belongs to it, our calling, conversion, justification, preservation. The antitype taught, and teaches, that God chose those whom he chose, in respect of their faith, which he foreknew. This is not a theological quibble, but a question of eminent practical interest. We do not want to be deprived of and diminish "the beautiful and glorious consolation that

God has so highly esteemed the conversion, righteousness, and salvation of every Christian, and so faithfully intended it, that, before the foundation of the world was laid, he took counsel concerning it, and decreed in his purpose how he would bring me to it, and keep me therein. Item, that he had so well and certainly intended to preserve my blessedness, because it could easily be lost from our hands through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, or torn and taken from us through the cunning and violence of the devil and the world, that he decreed and placed it in the almighty hand of our Saviour JEsu Christ, from which no one can tear us, to preserve it in his eternal purpose, which cannot be lacking or overthrown". From the beginning, "Lehre und Wehre" also emphasized the comforting side of this doctrine, stressed the certainty of salvation, which exists only with the right doctrine of the election of grace, is excluded by the false doctrine of the election of grace, pointed out in general the character of the promises of the gospel, that these pure promises of grace, On the other hand, he has proved that a Christian can and should become certain of his eternal election and his blessedness precisely through the general promises of grace in the gospel; that the general counsel of God in salvation, whose consolation is likewise indispensable to us, is not weakened or even annulled by the right doctrine of the election of grace.

The dispute about the election of grace soon led to a discussion about the doctrine of conversion. This was hardly possible in any other way. The assumption of our opponents that God, in his eternal election, had judged himself according to faith, has sense and reason only if faith is somehow made dependent on a man's conduct. And so we found early enough occasion to accuse the same of a synergistic doctrine of election by grace. The trade of conversion, as it appears, for example, in the 1881-1884 volume of "Lehre und Wehre," did not concern the possible competition of human will and divine grace in conversion itself, but came to a head with the question whether human conduct preceding conversion did not make conversion possible in the first place. This question was answered in the affirmative by our opponents. Their whole argumentation boiled down to the fact that man, through what is called antecedent grace, receives the power to refrain from what is called wilful resistance, and that the right use of this power, the actual refraining from wilful resistance, makes conversion on the part of God possible, indeed infallibly entails it. The main object of this was to give a rational answer to the question, why, with equal grace and with equal guilt on the part of man, some are converted and others not. To this we have replied, that man is by nature so wholly dead to all good, that even grace, when it is offered to him, is not to be accepted.

The fact that man is by nature so completely embittered against God and at enmity with God that he resists not only the law of God, which condemns him, but also the gospel of God, which wants to save him, with all his strength, with all his heart, maliciously and wilfully, until he is converted, and that it is God, God alone, who in conversion overcomes this very resisting and makes the willing out of the unwilling. The answer to the question, which of course also forced itself upon us, **Cur alii prae aliis,** we have in principle rejected as an insoluble mystery, and have simply contrasted, without rhyming, the sole efficacy of grace in those who believe and are saved, with the reverse, that those who finally perish have only themselves to complain of, because they have always persistently resisted the Holy Spirit, who in all earnestness sought to convert and save them also. In treating of this article, too, of conversion, "Doctrine and Reproof" has asserted from the beginning how salutary and beneficial right doctrine is to the faith and life of Christians, how dangerous to the soul, on the other hand, all synergism, according to the saying of the Apology: "Pious hearts and Christian consciences would not take a thousand worlds that our salvation might be upon us."

This very matter, of the general will of grace and the election of grace, of conversion, of the origin of faith and the preservation of faith, of the effect of the law and of the gospel, of coarse and subtle synergism, of self-decision, of **sola gratia, has** been dealt with again later, on given occasions, in this journal of ours, e.g. in 1887, 1893-1898, 1900, and especially in 1904-1909, since the intersynodal conferences had begun. We have always looked anew at the old truth, characterized it more closely from this side or that, and have become more and more certain of it, especially in the face of the various phases of error. Such dogmas, which are also contrary to the ecclesiastical course of time and the spirit of the age, can only be preserved intact if they remain in motion.

Independently of the doctrinal disputes just briefly outlined, another article of Lutheran doctrine, that of justification, has become the subject of controversy in recent decades. As early as 1872 the Synodical Conference had declared its support for the doctrine of objective or general justification. In 1888, "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) recalled this doctrine once again and declared, with regard to justification in general, that God in Christ had already justified the whole world and absolved it of its sins, that this forgiveness and righteousness acquired and obtained by Christ was presented in the gospel, offered and taken hold of by faith, and that for this reason faith is justified before God.

justification and salvation, because he appropriates such righteousness to himself. This description was presented by opposing papers as an "attack on the Lutheran doctrine of justification" and misinterpreted as if we taught justification without faith. The very same opponents who had first accused us of Calvinism and of denying God's general council of salvation, now resented the fact that we so strongly emphasized God's general will of grace and extended the forgiveness of sins through Christ to the whole world of sinners. For their part, they limited the meaning and effect of Christ's atoning death to the fact that only the possibility of the forgiveness of sins was opened up to sinners, a possibility which man's faith then made real. Thus, "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) dealt with this central article of Lutheran doctrine at that time, in 1888, 1889, later in 1894, 1895, and then, in defense against renewed attacks, again in the last years, since 1904, showing that a Christian can only take comfort in God's gracious judgment in life and death if it applies to the whole world of sinners and is independent of all human behavior, is not first brought about and caused by faith, but is only accepted by faith. That without faith, without acceptance, Christ's merit and forgiveness are lost to us, we have always emphasized. Recently we have also had occasion to discuss in more detail the nature of faith as a **velle et accipere, as** a receiving activity, in the face of an erroneous view which had caused unrest in the Saxon Free Church **and** finally led to a secession.

And if we now ask in what manner we conducted the doctrinal struggle, with what means we polemicized, what was the guiding principle of our teaching and defense, no attentive reader of "Doctrine and Defense" will be able to deny that we drew our weapons from the armory of God, the Scriptures, that the Scriptures were the standard, indeed the only real standard of our judgment. In the disputes we have touched upon, we have always placed in the foreground the **loci classici, dicta probantia of** Scripture concerning the doctrine in dispute, examined them according to wording, tendency, connection, and applied them to the points of controversy. How often have the Scriptural statements on election by grace, conversion, justification been treated in this paper! Yes, the Scriptures have been and are to us not only the norm, but also the source of doctrine. The method followed by "Doctrine and Doctrine" was not both that we first established certain propositions independently of Scripture and explained them in more detail, and then examined whether what we said was also in accord with Scripture, but rather that we took what we said, taught, elaborated, directly from the words of Scripture. It has often been said that the doctrinal controversy concerning the election of grace has driven us into the Scriptures.

That is true. But we must at the same time take this opportunity to point out that the principle of Scripture has always been in force within our Synod. From the beginning Walther declared as clearly and firmly as possible the Scriptures as the only norm and source of doctrine, emphasized as strongly as possible that it was not the business of the Church or of the teachers of the Church to form dogmas, to make doctrinal decisions, that rather all doctrine was given and decided in Scripture, that the profession of the Church and of ecclesiastical theology consisted only in confessing the truth revealed in Scripture, in defending it, in formulating it ever more precisely in the face of growing error. He therefore also expressly rejected the three instances of doctrine assumed by the newer theologians, Scripture, church doctrine, Christian consciousness. Cf. "Lehre und Wehre" 1888, p. 264 ff. And Walther himself also followed this correct principle. In his Synod papers, for example, which cover the whole field of Lutheran doctrine, and which are also richly and abundantly furnished with quotations, not proofs, but testimonies from the Fathers, he directly elicited from the quoted scriptural passages what he presented and inculcated as doctrine in free speech, in his own words, and what is then compiled after his death as Walther's theology in this volume. Likewise in his book of Church and Ministry.

In a Lutheran theological journal, of course, Luther and the Lutheran confession must also have their say. And so, as it has always done, "Lehre und Wehre" has also recalled Luther and Luther's teaching as summarized in the symbols of the Lutheran church in the doctrinal disputes and doctrinal articles of the past decades. Repeatedly, at various times, for example, Articles 2 and 11 of the Formula of Concord, **de libero arbitrio unb de aeterna praedestinatione,** as well as the 3rd Article, **de Justitia fidei, and** the 4th Article of the Apology, **de justificatione**, have been discussed and extensively used and utilized on all sides. But in so doing we have by no means placed a second teaching authority or doctrinal authority by the side of Scripture. When, according to ancient custom, we have formally coordinated God's Word and Luther's teaching, Scripture and Confession, it has always been in the sense and understanding that the pure teaching of the divine Word, which is scattered throughout the Bible, has found an adequate, concise expression in Luther's teaching and in the Lutheran Confession, precisely in the face of the errors with which Luther had to struggle. We have convinced ourselves that our confession, as it itself states, is drawn from the pure, clean well of Israel. What then, for example, are the shorter or longer statements of the Apology and the Formula of Concord, and especially those to which we have referred again and again, even according to form, but explanations and an-

Turn of the quoted Bible words? And we have found this very exegesis to be correct on repeated examination. When Luther began to lecture in Wittenberg, prophets and apostles, as a contemporary remarks, rose again from the dead. Luther has uncovered the long-buried well of Israel, has shed new light on the Gospel, on the Gospel of Paul, on the righteousness that is valid before God, on the Gospel of the grace and glory of God, and has opened up the right understanding of it again. And should we not rejoice in this bright light today? Certainly, whoever studies in the writings of Luther, whoever immerses himself in the confession of our church, who fetches at the fountain, in whose spirit the prophets and apostles come alive, who is radiated by the light and clarity of Scripture, who is affected by the divine consolation and by the divine power of Scripture. When we debated with our opponents at the intersynodal conferences on the one occasion on the basis of Eph. 1 concerning the election of grace, and on another occasion on the basis of the second article of the Formula of Concord concerning conversion, we dealt with them in both cases concerning God's Word, the right understanding of Scripture. And there is one more thing we would like to point out here. The fact that Luther became the teacher of Christianity did not happen by chance. Luther is the reformer of the church prophesied in the Scriptures, the prophet of these last days appointed by God, commissioned by God to proclaim the eternal gospel to the world once more before the end of the world. Luther, with the Word of Truth, judged the Antichrist, exposed this last greatest deception of Satan. And Antichrist with his lies remains according to Scripture until Christ comes. Papal leaven has also invaded the Protestant Church. And the many sects and ravings that have come in in a heap at the same time with Antichrist, and which Luther likewise refuted with the word of Scripture, are the teachers also of the sects of today. And so we have learned in Luther's school how to resist the errors even of our day with the word of Scripture. It is truly no denial or restriction of the principle of Scripture; it only promotes the knowledge of the truth of Scripture, and it is in accordance with Scripture when we keep our readers aware of Luther's teaching in our theological and generally ecclesiastical periodicals.

However, this journal has taken note not only of Luther and the Lutheran Confession, but also of the doctrinal exposition of the Fathers in general, especially of the Doctrinal Fathers of the Lutheran Church. The history of dogma also belongs to theology. But even these discussions were not **extra scripturam**. Every righteous Lutheran dogmatics of the present, as well as of the past, is based on Scripture, is essentially nothing to do with Scripture.

**The first and only theologians have studied the** Scriptures and handed them down to posterity. We are not the first and the only ones who have sat down behind the Scriptures, but others, many pious theologians, have studied the Scriptures before us and have handed down to posterity what they found in them, and have also served us with them. How then does one gain pure doctrine from the Scriptures? How does a theologian come to the firm conviction that a word of Scripture says only this and nothing else? Only in this way, that he makes use of all the given means of scriptural knowledge, that he keeps the words that are written before his eyes and lets them have an effect on him, that he makes use of the linguistic, grammatical, lexical aids, that he, because he is not alone in the world with his Bible, takes into consideration the scriptural research of others, of his contemporaries and of his ancestors. Only for this purpose and in this sense have we used the **dicta patrum.** Admittedly, however, the Scriptural principle also compels us to exercise criticism in this very area. The principle of Scripture demands of us that we examine and judge all teaching according to Scripture, that we distinguish between false teachers and right teachers, between gross abuse, falsification of Scripture, and the right, simple understanding of Scripture, that we are careful even with teachers who are otherwise right, whether they have not strayed from the straight path of Scripture on this or that point, that we are careful to exclude from our theology everything that does not agree with Scripture, that goes beyond Scripture, that is asserted without Scriptural foundation. Our journal has not escaped this criticism.

Thus, for example, "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) stated a difference between the doctrinal fathers of the Lutheran Church from the standpoint of Scripture. Already in 1875 Walther declared: "By the way, those do not know us who call our theology that of the 17th century. As highly as we appreciate the immense work done by the great Lutheran dogmatists of that period, it is not really they to whom we have returned, but above all our dear Concordia and Luther, in whom we have recognized the man whom God has chosen to be the Moses of His Church of the New Covenant, to lead out of it His Church which has fallen into the bondage of Antichrist, the pillar of smoke and fire of the golden and pure Word of God in front. The dogmatists of that time, however immeasurably rich treasures of knowledge and experience are stored up in them, so that we learn from them day and night with pleasure and joy, are nevertheless neither our Bible nor our confession; rather, even in them we already perceive here and there a turbidity of that stream which gushed forth so crystal-bright in the sixteenth century." "Lehre und Wehre," 1875, p. 67. Reference was still made in this connection to the systematization of doctrine attempted in those days, by which the purity of doctrine suffered

have. Walther's last lengthy article in "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) of 1880, in which the doctrinal controversy over the election of grace began, bears the heading: "Dogmengeschichtliches über die Lehre vom Verhältnis des Glaubens zur Gnadenwahl." (Dogmatic History of the Doctrine of the Relation of Faith to the Election of Grace). There he proved in detail that the doctrinal fathers of the sixteenth century, and indeed in accordance with Scripture, sat faith out as the consequence and effect of election, while the dogmatists of the seventeenth century, on the contrary, let faith precede the counsel of election. And this difference between the theology of the sixteenth and that of the seventeenth century has, in the verlaus of the controversy, become more and more apparent to us. We have recognized and shown that on the controversial points the genuine Lutheran doctrine is to be found with the doctrinal fathers of the Reformation age, while the later dogmatists, on whom our ecclesiastical opponents appealed, deviated from the **norma normans** and the **norma normata, in that** they, for example In the article on predestination, for example, they inserted the **intuitu fidei into the** choice; in the article on conversion, they attributed a **facultas non resistendi** mostly to the man prepared by the **gratia praeveniens**, but still natural, unconverted man; in the article on justification, they wanted to allow only the so-called **bonum justificum** or **meritum of Christ and** not also the **justificatio** itself to be the object of justifying faith. In repeatedly setting forth the agreement of our doctrine with the doctrine of the Fathers of the sixteenth century, we have not thereby ascribed an authoritative validity to the **consensus patrum,** but even thereby again have given credit only to Scripture and the Scriptural principle. For the theology of the sixteenth century was **de facto** pure scriptural theology and not yet influenced and clouded by systematization. What attracted and attracts us so powerfully in the writings of Luther and his comrades-in-arms, of Chemnitz and his contemporaries, is precisely this perception that in them the stream of the pure teaching of the divine Word gushed forth so crystalline.

Already during the Dispute over the Doctrine of Grace Election it became evident that our opponents handled the Scriptures differently than we do, and this has been demonstrated anew since the beginning of the intersynodal conferences. Our opponents always based their position on the context of Scripture and on the whole of Scripture, while we limited our doctrinal exposition and argumentation to those passages of Scripture in which the disputed articles were mentioned. And thus the principle of Scripture itself and its application, or the interpretation of Scripture, the **analogia fidei,** became the object of controversy. From that side the latter was understood to mean the harmonious whole or system, discernible even by Christians, produced by theologians, which, as the highest standard of Scripture interpretation, is still above parallelism, or the comparison of passages of Scripture dealing with the same doctrine. To us the analogy of faith was and is identical with the **clara**

**scriptura**, with the summa of the clear passages of Scripture, and we hold that only from those passages of Scripture which deal with a certain doctrine, not also from others which do not deal with it, is this very doctrine to be gathered, and that only in this way is the "Es stehet geschrieben" preserved intact. This subject has been discussed in detail in the last editions of "Lehre und Wehre" since 1903.

The opposition of the other Lutheran Synods of this country, especially of the Iowa and Ohio Synods, to our Synod, to the Synodical Conference, has at first given direction to our teaching and our defense. Then, however, this theological journal of ours has followed, as it has always done in recent decades, the development of the newer theology of Germany, to which our theology is likewise in opposition.

It was about the middle of the eighties of the last century that the doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture became the subject of lively discussion in the ecclesiastical circles of Germany. Several professors of the University of Dorpat had thrown the modern ideas of Scripture and the origin of Scripture, which had hitherto remained more within the guild of scholars, into the public domain by means of lectures and popular writings. These manifestations had aroused some protests, but had found approval on the part of the most renowned representatives of German orthodoxy, e.g. Luthardt, Harnack senior, Dieckhoff. This ecclesiastical movement gradually came to a standstill after almost all the larger pastoral conferences of the German regional churches, and especially those that were "positively" oriented - liberal theology does not want to know anything at all about inspiration - had accepted the new dogma. The sum of this new wisdom is that one must distinguish in Scripture between external, non-essential things and essential things, the actual doctrinal content; in the former respect there are palpable errors and contradictions in the Bible; the inspiration, the divine effect in the origin of Scripture, consists essentially in the connection of the many writings into a harmonious whole suitable as the canon of the church, in the "absolute unity and wholeness". We have opposed these statements, which, by the way, have also found resonance in the local sects, and have stood up for the much maligned verbal inspiration and absolute inerrancy of Scripture. We stated our agreement with the old ecclesiastical Lutheran doctrine of Scripture and inspiration, as finely formulated by the later dogmatists, but already vigorously testified to by the earlier Lutheran theologians, Luther himself at the head. We rejected the insinuation as if Luther had taken a "freer" position in this article. The main thing for us, however, was also here the Scripture itself, what the Scripture says about itself.

itself and its origin. Cf. "Lehre und Wehre", volume 1884. 1885. 1891-1893. 1896. 1897. 1900. 1901.

The newer German theologians have continually turned their interest to the Christological dogmas. And here, too, we are speaking of the more positive ones, which still recognize Christ as an eternal, divine person. The same have continued to work on the foundation laid by Thomasius, Hofmann, and others, and have cultivated and in various ways elaborated the two axioms of modern Christology, that the Son is subordinate to the Father as the divine original personality, and that the Son of God, at His Incarnation, laid aside His divine glory, omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience. "Lehre und Wehre" has often, most extensively in the volumes of 1888 and 1894, brought modern subordinatianism and modern kenosis into the light of Scripture, and has recorded on the basis of Scripture the ancient Christian confession of Christ: "The 'Most High' only thou art," and the Lutheran **communicatio idiomatum,** now regarded with such disdain, that "God's death," "God's blood," "God's torture." If this ground is shaken, if the honour and dignity of the person of Christ is in any way touched, the work of Christ is also shaken, and we are in danger of losing the one consolation of Christians, reconciliation with God.

We have referred to recent German theology in general on various occasions in this theological journal of ours. We cannot go into the details in this summary review. We have then also characterized this theology in two of its chief representatives. Until about twenty years ago the German theological world was divided into two camps: Frankians and Ritschlians were opposed to each other. Whoever compares the three longer articles in "Lehre und Wehre," "Walther als Theologe," Jahrgang 1888-1891, "Ritschls Theologie," 1894. 1895, "Franks Theologie," 1896, gains about an insight into three main theological tendencies of modern times. Walther was the Scriptural theologian, took Christian doctrine simple-mindedly from the simple-minded words of the Bible, added nothing to it, detracted nothing from it, attempted no harmony, dispensed with rhyming, and in this way, measured against Scripture, has found ecclesiastical orthodoxy, Athanasian, Augustinian, Lutheran orthodoxy, to be tried and tested. Ritschl, who developed his system from natural, depraved reason, emancipated from God, and did allotria with Scripture, has made **tabula rasa** with all Christianity. From Frank's mill, who constructed his theological system out of the so-called Christian ego, and behind it still grappled with Scripture and church doctrine, all Christian dogmas have emerged in a mutilated, crippled form. Walther's theology, and that is nothing other than the genuine theology that Walther put back on course, is the only theology of the Christian world.

Lutheran scriptural theology, still lives and works and sprouts vigorously in this country and elsewhere. Ritschl's theology, like Frank's, has pretty much disappeared from the scene. Other luminaries have taken their place and have given new shade to the so-called "liberal" and "ecclesiastical" direction. Of these latter "Lehre und Wehre" Wohl has already taken note on occasion, e. g. in an article on the nature of Christianity according to Professor Harnack, 1901, and then especially in "Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtlichen"; but these theories of the present day still require a detailed exposition and judgment. The characterization of the state of the Christian Church at the beginning of the 20th century, 1902, also refers to the newer German theology.

The newer theology has devoted far more energy and work to biblical questions, especially to biblical criticism, than to dogmatic questions. Modern critics have only given the old rationalistic denial of divine revelation, of miracles in the Bible, of biblical prophecy a new garment and motivated it differently. And the apologists of the Bible have to a large extent given room to this view, trying to make the revelation historical, trying to harmonize the miracles with the ordinary course of events, recognizing only the so-called typical prophecy. And especially they have made concessions to negative criticism in biblical criticism in the strict sense of the word. The present critics affirm the apostolic origin of most of the New Testament writings, while at the same time declaring their **dissensus** with the teaching of the apostles, but in exchange have dissected the Old Testament Scriptures all the more cruelly and transformed them into a mosaic composed of the most colorful fragments. This criticism of Scripture is closely connected with the principle of evolution, which the religion of Israel, and then also the Christian dogma, derived from the old heathen religions and philosophies. We could not avoid these critical questions either. "Lehre und Wehre" has, contrary to the current of the times, upheld in the Biblical investigations in question, on the basis of the Bible, direct revelation, direct prophecy, and the miracle as such, as the intervention of the almighty hand of the living God in natural development, by focusing on the greatest of all miracles, the resurrection of Christ, the central miracle, that is, the person of the God-Man Himself. Cf. volume 1884. 1885. 1890-1892. 1895. 1896. preface of 1903. The more recent Pentateuch criticism in its connection with the development of the history of religion has been thoroughly expounded and illuminated volume 1904. 1905.

Our ecclesiastical situation meant that we still had to take a stand against the errors of the surrounding sects.

have. Thus against the Calvinism of the Presbyterians, the **Westminster Confession of Faith in** 1898. 1905, against the fanciful doctrine of the Lord's Supper in 1904, against the rejection of infant baptism on the part of the Baptists in 1909. From these striking works it is evident that we have sought to gain an ever firmer foothold in the Scriptural ground on which our opposition to the sects is based. The Papal Church, whose latest development has been followed in the Ecclesiastical History, was the subject of several articles in 1892 and 1893. The atheism of the present day, the modern atheistic theories of evolution, were considered in 1900 and 1909. What our Synod and its organs have clearly testified to in earlier doctrinal disputes, the voice of the Lutheran Church and the Scriptures of Church and Ministry, has not yet 'faded and faded away. In the face of the Romanizing tendency, we have also recently emphasized again that the Christian church is nothing other than the congregation of believers, and a local Christian congregation nothing other than a group of believers in a certain place, Word and Sacrament, however, only the **notae ecclesiae,** from which we can certainly conclude that the **una sancta** also has a place in our place. Since our "Magazin für evangelisch-lutherische Homiletik" (Magazine for Evangelical-Lutheran Homiletics) became at the same time a magazine for pastoral theology, topics from the pastoral and generally practical field have been treated in this latter magazine and only sporadically also in "Lehre und Wehre" (Teaching and Wehre). We will refrain from these here, just as we have not taken into account in this review the content of our journal, which is independent of the time and the movement of the times. For example, we will only refer to a faculty report "on the lodge question" in 1894, a question that is still a burning issue for us today. question of time. Incidentally, "Lehre und Wehre" has reminded us in many a preface and on other occasions that the pure doctrine of the divine Word, which it presents and defends, obliges Christians and Christian theologians to a holy, godly way of life and can only be preserved if we resist and control not only all false doctrine, but also all godlessness in the world.

With this retrospective we also take a look into the future. The oldest member of our ministry, Father D. Wunder, concludes a vote of thanks published in the "Lutheraner", prompted by the celebration of his 60th anniversary in office, with the words: "The Lord has made me worthy to see, during 60 years of office, how small our Synod began, how gloriously it has spread, and how bravely and victoriously it has fought. May He continue to keep it in pure doctrine, let it grow, and set it to be a blessing to many!" Certainly, God's grace and blessing will remain with our Synod in the future, so that it may also be a blessing to others.

blessing if it sticks to pure doctrine. This is also true of the theological journal of our Synod. We readily confess that many a human weakness, many an erroneous expression, and many an unsound detail have been mixed up in our exposition. But we do not renounce the glory that what we have taught, inculcated, and defended here **ex professo** was pure doctrine, the doctrine of the divine word. It was not our merit, but a pure work of God's grace. And so we owe it to the grace of God to hold fast what God has given us. Unionism is a major danger even in the present day. The other church communities around us are working towards unification, unification at the expense of doctrine, of truth. So let it be our resolution, the slogan for further work in doctrine: No change and dislocation of our doctrinal position! No swaying and wavering! No compromise between truth and error! No veiling or weakening of the clear, distinct knowledge bestowed upon us by God! Rather, faithfulness to the end, faithfulness in doctrine and faithfulness also in practice! God preserve us pure doctrine in the generation to come! G. St.

## "Luther's Newly Discovered Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,

Under this heading **Lic.** Wilhelm Braun published an article last year in the September number of the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift", pages 730-754. The same author also published an article in the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" with the heading: "**Lutherus redivivus",** in which he also gives information about the newly discovered Luther commentary. "The year 1908" - says here Braun, Sp. 949 - "will be entered in the annals of Luther research with golden letters. It has, after all, brought us a Christmas present about which we as Protestant Christians may rejoice extraordinarily. A new Luther scripture has celebrated its resurrection, and we are the first to read it. For it has never been printed. Only a few have known it in manuscript. Luther's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans from 1515/16! **Lutherus redivivus**! Luther speaks to us across the centuries! And it is the Epistle to the Romans, the epistle, which influences him decisively, and it is a year before the Thephs that he commented on Paul! Fortunate enough!" Now, first of all, as to the fate, discovery, and condition of this valuable commentary on Luther, **Lic.** Braun writes in the "N. K. Z.," pp. 730 ff:

It is probably a rarity that a posthumous work - and even, as in this case, edited 400 years after its writing - meets with interest. In Luther's case we understand this exception. The gift which Professor Johannes Ficker-Strasbourg, the discoverer and editor of this new valuable Luther writing, placed on our Christmas table in 1908 has been eagerly awaited for years by all Protestant theologians. 1) The excerpts communicated especially in "Denifle's Luther and Lutheranism" had only increased the attention. One does not go too far, then, in claiming to possess in this work the most important document of the Reformation, whose significance can only be compared with the world-historical Theses of October 31, 1517. It is not merely the interpretation of the Pauline Epistle which was fundamental to Luther's development, but it also dates from the years when Luther was being urged on to the new paths: Autumn 1516 closes the lecture on the Epistle to the Romans, and a year later at the Castle Church in Wittenberg were to be read the sentences that became the letter of renunciation to Rome, about the discovery of the valuable manuscript D. Ficker gives interesting notes in the preface. It had been known for centuries that Luther's lecture on the Epistle to the Romans, which he delivered during his monastic years, was available in manuscript, but it was thought to be lost. Even Wigand had known it about the year 158-7. For he writes: "Vidi initia Lutheri, quomodo is adhuc in cappa degens totum psalterium tam attente perlegerit, ut de verbo ad verbum sua manu glossarit: item epistolam ad Romanos et Ebraeos. Autographa enim ipsius in mea manu habui atque inspexi et miratus sum." It was then a stroke of luck that Dr. Vopel, now a cathedral preacher in Naumburg and a friend of Prof. Ficker, discovered in the Vatican library in Rome in the spring of 1899, not the original, but a reliable copy of the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. In the case of the copy of this document put into the work by D. Ficker, it was discovered that it came from the hand of Aurifaber. It can be established with a fair degree of certainty that it came into the possession of Ulrich Fugger, who was interested in all writings on the history of the Reformation, around 1550 or 1560 "ex autographo descriptus", and whose valuable library was transferred to the Heidelberg University Library in the Electorate of Palatinate, where it was placed in the Church of the Holy Spirit. It then shared the tragic fate of that library and was sent to Rome by Leo Allatius, the papal archivist, after the conquest of Heidelberg by Tilly (1623). From papal archives we drew the knowledge of this latest work of Luther. In the meantime, however, the original, the Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans, in Luther's own hand, has been rediscovered, to the surprise of D. Ficker, who had searched for it all over Europe, in the Royal Library in Berlin, where it had been publicly displayed in the showcase for a long time without attracting any attention. In valuable gold-pressed binding with the year 1582 printed on it, it bears the coat of arms of the Elector August of Saxony and the Electress Anna. A collotype plate added to the Ficker edition shows the fine handwriting of Luther, who signed over and signed the text of the Epistle to the Romans and covered the margin with his remarks. For the way he worked quickly,

1) Johannes Ficker, Anfänge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung. Volume I: Luther's Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans 1515/16. Leipzig, Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Theodor Weicher), 1908.

can also be cited the curiosity that he, apparently when the paper had run out, briefly used the back of an escort letter for an Augustinian arrived from Neustadt (of October 28, 1515). Despite the care with which Aurifaber's copy adhered to the original, there are nevertheless considerable deviations. Quite apart from the fact that some of Luther's marginal notes have fallen by the wayside, words are sometimes suppressed which often seemed incidental to the copyist. Of what far-reaching importance such an oversight may be, only one example may be cited. Denifle, supported by the copy, has accused Luther of "forgery" because he changed the Augustinian quotation "concupiscentiam in baptismate remitti, non ut non sit, sed ut non imputetur" (de nupt. et concup. I, 25. 28) so that he let the statement be made not of concupiscence, but of "peccatum," which indeed modifies the sense. According to the original, however, Luther never quoted the passage without always placing next to "pssoatum" the original word "concupiscentiam." The error, therefore, was merely in the copyist. Nevertheless, D. Ficker has consciously not yet fully accomplished the important work which the edition causes on the basis of the original, the copy and several also still preserved student postscripts. It is only a preliminary edition that he has organized. The actual edition, the careful preparation of which will take a great deal of time, is to follow in the Weimar edition. After all, Prof. Ficker has stored up such a wealth of material in the notes, which at first sight seem inconspicuous, that it would require many pens to work this virgin soil. One gets the impression of the sum of work that still has to be done to conquer the reformer's world of thought.

About the genuinely Lutheran concrete style of this commentary, sometimes decorated with coarse pictures, **Lic.** Braun thus lets himself be heard, p. 732 ff:

The commentary is written in Latin, but in that fluid style which makes Luther's Latin writings often easier to read for us than the sometimes archaistic German ones. In between, however, there are flashes of German expressions, which then seem all the more immediate in their naturalness and fidelity. According to the testimony of one of the listeners, Oldecops, this is what made these lectures so attractive: "De studenten horten in gern, wente siner geliken was da nicht gehöret, de ein jder latinisch Wort so brav verdutschet hatte." The affirmation: "scio et confido" in Rom. 14, 14 is rendered, for instance, "Ich weyß uund Bhns gewisß" (I, 124) or "ich weyß uund bhn keck, darffs kecklich sagen" (II, 324). Concerning Rom. 12, 6, it is stated that prophecy' bears a certain resemblance to faith, inasmuch as the latter also refers to the world of the unseen, and in this the Greek word αναλογία is rendered by the German, "Es ellicht hm. Es sihet im gleich" (II, 277). The free choice of grace of predestination is brought closer to the German dürch the winged word: "Wem es Wirt, dem Wirt es; wen es trifft, den trifft's" (II, 224). The arrogance of the scholars who cling to preconceived opinions is castigated with the proverb: "Weiß leut narrn gröblich." Following Rom. 15, he warns against exaltation over fallen men, calling out to a woman who wants to associate only with pure sisters, "Höer susterlein hör!" You stand!' See that you do not fall! "One must see the other's shameful cover!" How extraordinarily do these interspersed

German chunks the liveliness of the speech! Sometimes he also resorts to pictures to illustrate the thoughts. They are not all new. It is a parable used by Augustine when he compares the effect of the law from the human heart with the reaction of water from the lime which it makes glow. The water is good; it only makes the fire hidden in the lime appear. The law is good; it only drives out the sin which before slept in man's heart, that it may be known (I, 63)! In contrast to this is another parable of Luther's character, as he uses it much. The story of the "Good Samaritan", however, suggests it to him. Man resembles the sick man, the man who has fallen among the murderers. He is half-sick, inasmuch as weakness assails him again and again; he is half-healthy, inasmuch as he is excluded to the hospital of Christ, and does not reject the divine Physician, but believes him, who has promised him healing, and has already begun it. Here again the contradiction, that the law is of God, and the inward sickness of man aggravates sin, is made clear by a medical example. The physician who forbids wine to the sick does not reprove the wine, but only the fitness of the same for the patient (II, 180. 56. 108. 189). One can already see from these examples: Pictures do not come into consideration for Luther in a purely decorative sense. He goes out of things, therefore he takes the comparisons from his immediate surroundings. It is possible that, as Ficker says, the building work at the Augustinian monastery provided him with visual material. It is not high praise that he gives to the craftsmen of his time when he says of them: "they work as if they were asleep" (II, 286). Such comparisons recur in the Tal, as when he compares the barren dissection of concepts, in which the whole theology of scholasticism seems to proceed, to the foolish action of a man who follows the work of the carpenter and always looks only at what kind of wood the latter uses, without paying attention to what he builds with it (II, 199). Or when he draws the following parallel: an artist is good if he knows how to criticize the bunglers, if he works better compared to these bunglers, and if he can finally communicate his art to others. Thus God is just in so far as he punishes the unjust, compared with our unrighteousness, alone can be considered just, and in so far as he finally communicates his justice to men. But as an artist can teach only those who admit their inability, so God justifies only the humble (II, 59. 61). Thus it is always vivid examples that are needed. Nor does he disdain the anecdote, which, of course, leaves nothing to be desired in the way of crude naturalness, such as the story of that monk who sought a special holiness in suppressing the need to urinate, but immediately abandoned this prodigality when another promised to compete with him in it (II, 243). And so he is not afraid to put excessive criticism of ecclesiastical conditions, which immediately wants to blame the deficiencies of an individual on the whole state, in its place in a massive way: "Have you not also made your mother's womb smell bad? If you are so pure, it is a wonder that the apothecaries have not yet bought you as a balm" (II, 335). He reaches into the treasure of German proverbs: "nemo potest diutius pacem habere quam velit ejus vicinus" (Schiller: "It is not possible for the most pious to live in peace if it does not please the wicked neighbor"). He quotes passages from poets: "nitimur in vetitum semper cupimusque negata! Quod licet ingratum est, quod non licet acrius urit. Quod sequitur fugio, quod fugit ipse sequor" (I, 115; II, 40). Thus also the form in which

Luther offers his thoughts, that stamp of the concrete, the vivid, and the practical that explains his popularity. He wants to interpret the meaning of Scripture practically (II, 272), because the application of the present to the doctrina is of the highest value for understanding (II, 301).

The form of interpretation in this commentary by Luther is still that of glosses or paraphrases and marginal notes and of scholia. In Braun's judgment, however, this commentary on the Epistle to the Romans testifies to an advance in exegesis over that in Luther's immediately preceding lectures on the Psalms. **Lic.** Braun writes page 735 et seq:

As far as the interpretation itself is concerned, it is divided according to medieval practice into the gloss, which consists partly of paraphrases of the individual biblical words, partly of marginal notes with brief explanations, and into the bulkhead, which rolls up and discusses the basic ideas of the apostle in the larger context. It is based on the Latin Vulgate text. But it proves Luther's extraordinary mental alertness that immediately after the publication of the Greek Testament by Erasmus (February, 1516), beginning with the 9th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he took the original text into account, and naturally conceded to it the decisive decision. Thus he kept pace with the progress of scholarship. His academic teaching gift is further shown in the organization of a special text of the Epistle to the Romans, which the Wittenberg printer Gruneberg had to produce especially for the lecture. It was a so-called Jnterlinear edition. The individual lines of the text were spaced so far apart that the students could write the given interpretation in between. The task of the theological teacher in those days was not very broad. He was in the main only the "collector" who had to "collect" the exegetical and dogmatic opinions of the authorities, the church fathers or scholastics, "like a bee" and to deal with them. There was, therefore, a dreary, dry streak of formalism running through the lectures. There was no spark of religious emotion; one judged, as Luther rebukes in harsh criticism, of God and divine things "like the cobbler of leather" (II, 27). As the ape imitates man, so the Thomists or the Scotists adhered to words, not to the spirit of their great school heads (II, 165). The barren dissection of concepts, the schematic treatment of quidditates and qualitates, the distinctions between essentia and accidentia of religious objects disgusted Luther. "I have wasted many years in these studies, and know from experience that the profit is nil' and it is killing time to deal with them" (II, 199). Indeed, if we compare Luther's lectures on the Psalms, which immediately preceded that on the Epistle to the Romans, we clearly notice in the latter an advance in the Reformer's exegesis, although there too the new is already stirring. The traditional interpretation, the study of the tropological, anagogical, allegorical interpretation of a passage of Scripture, still has its right there. Lyra, the representative of the simple explanation of the literal sense, is still looked at askance by Luther. In the Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans, however, he is the chief authority. It is true that allegory is still sometimes used as an aid, but it has only decorative value. Thus, when the cover of Boaz, under which Ruth seeks shelter, becomes the symbol that sin is covered by the indwelling of Christ in us, or in the difficult passage in Romans (Rom. 9, 28)

the "word of faith being shortened," is referred to from the fact that its covering is too short to cover both the old and the new man, only the new has room under it, or finally, when it is said of the ungodly in Rom. 3, 13, "their gullet is an open grave," and Luther remarks on this, "Many doctors do not bite, they do not grind the sinner with their teeth, that is, they do not reprove him, but they devour him as he is, flattering him, palliating his sins, or forgiving them speedily" (II, 113. 234. 80). But these are exceptions. In general Luther sticks to the plain grammatical sense of the word. In reading the Resormation Christ, the change of times presses itself irrefutably upon the modern reader. From how totally different points of view is the exegesis of that time and of today dominated! Whether the comparison turns out in our favor, we would like to leave undecided! The philological floods our whole interpretation of Scripture. More or less admittedly, the treasury of the apostles and prophets becomes a cabinet of antiquities and rarities, and one is perfectly satisfied when one has discovered the Jewish or Greek tassel on the hems of the biblical writers. One may sneer with a superior smile that the world of a Paul in Reformation contemplation looks to us like a sixteenth-century city, like those contemporary pictures in which JEsus and his disciples move about Jerusalem as in a mediaeval fair or church consecration: religiously more fruitful is this way of looking at things, after all, compared with ours in the history of religion. Luther does not dwell on philological trivia. He looks into the heart of Scripture. His interpretation begins, "Here the great gate opens into the understanding of Scripture: that all things are to be known from Christ." "It is time that we turn to other studies (than the scholastic) and learn JEsum Christum," "et hunc crucifixum" (I, 4; II, 199). This is his guiding point of view; everywhere one has the impression: what Luther writes is personal, original experience. It is confessiones that are set down here. And yet it is again nothing other than a presentation of Pauline faith. This is not to be wondered at, considering the extensive affinity of the two natures and the peculiar time situation in which they worked. Looking over the whole, one can say: Three chapters of the Epistle to the Romans had a resounding effect on Luther: Rom. 3, the theme of righteousness: "So we helped that man might be justified without the work of the law, through faith alone"; Rom. 7, the song "de profundis" about sin: "The good that I want I do not do, but the evil that I do not want I do"; and Rom. 9, the problem of predestination: "So now He has mercy on whom He wills, and He casts out whom He wills!" Here lay the knots on which the Reformer labored; here also lay the solution which delivered him and which he passed on as a liberating message.

In the following, **Lic**. Braun reproduces and characterizes the doctrinal content of this commentary. We must leave it open for the time being whether he has hit the right mark everywhere, since the commentary itself is not yet available to us. The doctrine of the righteousness of faith is presented by Lic**. Braun,** p. 737 ff. as follows:

Everything great is born out of discontent. So it could not fail that Luther, in his search for justice, corroded the common sense of what was thought to be justice with caustic criticism. We

notice the personal undertone when he once says: "the word 'justice' makes him more ill than if he were robbed" (II, 273). But his psychological perspicacity also enabled him to detect with a fine sense the evil foulness that lies beneath in that philistine respectability and respectability which finds everything in order with itself. He turns his eyes inward from spots that leave not of color. How keen is one for others' faults, how blind for one's own! The usurer points his fingers at the adulterer, the latter at the latter; neither turns back from his own door. Thus one sees in others all that is bad, and in himself all that is good (I, 15. 16). When then others are punished by the judgment of God, one cannot suppress a certain gloating: "eja juste bene recte bene meruit, while one should say: Yesterday to thee, today to me! The little dog is beaten that the dog may be warned" (I, 17). Our righteousness is in many cases nothing other than the riding of principles; one is infallible, insists on one's point of view, and allows oneself to be dissuaded by nothing and no one, so that in a thousand cases the sharp word applies: "summa justitia summa stultitia" (11, 76). The error of imagining something miraculous about one's righteousness is explained by the fact that one fulfills the commandments only according to outward works, but does not in other respects stir them up even with the finger (Matt. 23:4), that is, not even with a little start of the heart in the realm of the inner world of thought and will (II:45). Undoubtedly, if the commandment or prohibition did not exist, one would refrain from doing good in innumerable cases. Thus one does not do it from an inner inclination (II, 73). This devalues the apparently so pious achievements of by far the most monks. They are not done from a joyful heart. If the canonical laws which imposed on the monk tonsure, celibacy, habit, hearing, etc., no longer existed, all churches and altars would be abandoned in one year. The proverb is indeed telling: "Wens bisß aufs die conscientz kumpt?" (II, 320). Here, however, Luther is prepared for contradiction. The men of ecclesiastical piety do not want to have their fame stolen from them without further ado. According to Scotus, the good intention, the intentio, is sufficient to vindicate the moral value of a deed. One makes a virtue out of necessity. "There the devil sits in the background and says: 'Smuggle yourself, libs heresy, we'll have you.' And so the monk goes into the choir, sings and prays, and thinks to himself: 'Sich eulichen, wie schon bistu, hastu nu psawen federnn?' And even if he is bored, if he counts leaves and verses, whether the prayer will not soon be over, he consoles himself with the intentio." Yes yes, Luther remarks, whether you also roar like a lion, the donkey's ears still look out of the fur thrown over them (II, 321). It was Luther's concern to hold up a mirror before the eyes of monasticism, which in the eyes of the superficially judging world apparently fulfilled all righteousness, in which it could see its true face. There was a danger here of reassuring oneself by proving oneself in the struggle against sensual charms, the "corporalia," and of failing to recognize that the main enemy is approaching just when one has reached a certain height in chastity, piety, wisdom, in the spiritualia (II, 94). How dim are the springs from which this outward disease flows: Praise of man, just note also that false, dishonest modesty which so naively poses as ignorant or, in the moral sense, as a "philanderer," in order to receive compliments afterwards as to what a learned or, in the last analysis, unconsciously genuinely Christian man one is (I, 11); whim: one goes to the

We are not guided by the good of others, but even when we do good, we do it because we enjoy it (I, 7; II, 94), in the last analysis selfishness: we are particularists because we force the good into the confines of our selfish ends; we lack the view of the universal to act for the sake of God or humanity (II, 184). It would be our duty, similarly as Christ emptied Himself of His power, wisdom, and absolute goodness, so also to hide our virtue and righteousness (II, 13). In his treatment of the Epistle to the Romans, in which the Pharisaic errors are so vigorously dealt with, Luther had to confront step by step those qui sibi justi videntur. After all, Paul's whole epistle was not addressed to obvious sinners, but precisely to those who trusted to be saved by their works (II, 29). But now, with all clarity, from the same Epistle to the Romans came not only the negation, the criticism of vulgar "righteousness," but also the position: the justitia Dei. One can argue about the point in time at which the consoling light of the well-known Romans passage (Rom. 1, 17) emanated to him from the revelation of God's justice - Ficker assumes in his preface, on the basis of a Melanchthonian statement, that Luther first read about the Epistle to the Romans, then about the Psalter, a very early occupation with the classical saying - but that the discovery of how the dreaded word of justitia Dei contained the sweetest consolation was downright groundbreaking for the Reformer is certain. By Luther's own admission, Augustine's understanding of God's justice, according to which it is to be conceived not as a justice, qua Deus justus est, but as one, qua induit hominem, cum justificat impium (I, 32), formed the bridge for the new insight. It is an objective righteousness, coming from without (extranea), from heaven, which saves us after our own internal righteousness has melted away under the sharp reagent of the absolute demand of the law (II, 2). The accusing thoughts that come from our conscience are opposed by the apologetic ones that look to Christ and hold to this, "This one has done enough for me; he is righteous, he died for me, he has made his righteousness mine and my sin his. Now I am free" (II, 44). Thus the saints are always sinners, namely inwardly, and always at the same time they are justified, namely outwardly in the estimation of God, who considers them righteous in spite of factual sinfulness (II, 104). It is not in being (esse rei), in some moral constitution which man has to exhibit, as the scholastics would have it, that righteousness lies, but in the gracious look of God, who wills the sinner to be counted righteous for the sake of the confession of his unrighteousness and the invocation of God's justice (II, 121). In the last sentences we see at the same time the concept of God's acceptance, which is common in scholasticism and which Luther frequently encounters, especially in his teacher Occam, playing in, with the difference, however, that the acceptance which the sinner finds with God is mediated through Christ. Propter Christum Deus acceptat (II, 124)! Now naturally this righteousness, in order not to be drawn on wantonness, has at the same time a subjective side. The atomism of sanctity of works is dismissed. It cannot be considered as the right conduct of the subject. The Lord looks to the person rather than to the service. It is not by right action that one becomes just - here a reproving glance is cast at the ethics of Aristotle, who asserts: justitia fit ex actibus (II, 14) - but

one must first become righteous before one can act rightly (I, 3. 5). A monkey can copy a man in individual movements, a layman a bishop whose official acts he fraudulently presumes; therefore the first is neither a man nor the second a bishop. Still less is one, when he performs individual righteous works, a righteous man (II, 85). There must, therefore, be a uniform fundamental disposition which makes man pleasing to God. What is this? To this the later Luther answered roundly: faith. In our commentary on the Epistle to the Romans this comes more and more to the fore in the last chapters. But the dominating mood of the subject towards his God in the vast majority of the lecture is something quite different: humility! Humilitas tota perfectaque justitia (II, 39)! This is the influence of mysticism, which unmistakably makes him look at the Pauline thoughts from a certain point of view. We must not forget that Luther sat behind Tauler during the lecture on the Epistle to the Romans and wrote enthusiastically to his friends about this theology which fascinated him. But we also find the old familiar images from mysticism worked into the commentary. "As all the light of the earth belongs not to this sun, but to the sun that illuminates it, so all the praise of the Church belongs to Christ. The Church always confesses her nakedness and poverty in the Song of Songs" (I, 115). This ideal of humility is here still completely fitted into the framework of medieval monasticism. One must submit to all creatures. One must believe every word that comes from the mouth of an ecclesiastical superior, even submit to the pronouncements of any good and holy man; in short, "in immensum" one must humble oneself (II, 39. 88). Thus the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is an extremely characteristic monument already with regard to the first point from the Reformation program, the justitia Dei! The basic lines of the new are there, but the old is conserved as long as it is possible. It is as Ficker characterizes it in an excellent image: the Reformer resembles the oak in spring, on which the young green shoots stand fresh and unfolded, but still tenaciously girded by the brown winter leaves, which can only be beaten down with effort.

What Luther teaches in this commentary about the nature of sin, about sin in the born-again, and how he interprets Rom. 7, 14 and judges the sacramentarism of the papists and their disdain for the works of Berus, about this Braun page 742 ff. thus spreads:

When the change in the conception of the "justitia Dei" took place in Luther's soul cannot be fixed in time. On the other hand, it is possible to determine exactly how the Reformer thought differently about the nature of sin in different periods of his life. In 1512 he reproduced the usual scholastic doctrine of it; in 1515 he rejected it and vividly agreed with the isolated exponents of his new conception, first of all with Lombard. Between these two years lies the reversal. What caused it? We will try to enumerate the factors that contributed to the formation of the inner conviction. In the first place our attention will turn to the Epistle to the Romans. Did Paul have an influential effect on Luther's new understanding? Most certainly! And evidently because Luther did not find in him a definition of sin, as, for example, scholasticism, with the exertion of all its ingenuity, had done in the case of sin.

The reason for this was that the inner struggles of the soul were described in Rom. 7 in a shocking way. It was an old exegetical question, with which already Augustin had argued, whether the important chapter shows the sin in the state of the natural man or in that of the born again Christian. It is characteristic how the question is resolved in Modern Theology and in Reformation Theology! The former, for instance, observes the use of language, and states that the termini αάρξ and νους lead rather to the state outside grace, because the redeemed feels at most a contrast between αάρξ and πνεύμα. Luther is quite different! Out of religious experience he decides the matter! As a disciple of Augustine, he is imbued with the conviction that the natural man is literally abandoned by all good spirits-he attaches no value to the spark of good, the syntherefis; he is in this state tota caro (II, 173). When, therefore, the Apostle speaks in Rom. 7 of a two-sidedness in man, of an attachment of the spirit, which hates evil, to the flesh, which stubbornly opposes good impulses, it is clear that this chapter speaks of the struggles of the born-again Christian. Only the latter recognizes (7:14) that he is carnal; the unconverted man is blind. Only this one is able to hate evil; Ps. 35, 5 expressly says of the ungodly that he does not hate wickedness. After all, according to the whole tenor of the passage, the subject is not an utterly lost man, who can only do evil, but only such a one as does not do good as often, as great, or with such ease as he would like. Here the Augustinian interpretation of the Pauline passage, the distinction between facere and perficere, applies: the born-again Christian can facere good, that is, conari, machinari, desideria movere, but not perficere, he cannot act without the resistance of the flesh. Accordingly it is one and the same person of whom the apostle makes opposite statements, because caro and spiritus are united in him, about as the rider cannot act without the horse, nor the latter without the former. Between the two there is a communio idiomatum as in Christ, whose person was at once living and dead. It is a marriage in which we are at once woman propter carnem and man propter spiritum (II, 170 ff.). If Luther thus allowed the apostle to relate the whole dramatic description of the moral struggle in the human heart to the state of the regenerate, it was clear and covered by Paul's authority that sin played a much more serious role even in the state of grace than had hitherto been the word. There was no doubt about it: the pardoned person was at once righteous, because covered by the righteousness of Christ and by the mercy of God, and at the same time still a sinner, because the flesh lingered on at least in the lust that remained behind (II, 176). The exegetical understanding gained here, however, must be applied to other sentences of Paul which seem to say the opposite. Thus, the view of the Novatians, following Rom. 6, 10, that one must die to sin once, from which the uniqueness of repentance is inferred, is refuted by pointing out that the "semel" refers only to the eternity and unconditional sufficiency of grace, so that one need not seek any other redemption. In favor of continued repentance, even in the state of grace, speaks not only the experience that the circle of virtues is an infinite one, and therefore all can hardly be fulfilled, but also the Scripture: "Seven times in a day the righteous falleth, and as oft as he riseth up" (Prov. 24:16); the Lord to Peter: "I say unto thee, not seven times, but

seventy times seven times" (Matth. 18, 22); the example of Peter, who fell into the sin of hypocrisy after receiving the Holy Spirit (Gal, 2), known to be a mortal sin (I, 158). Now Luther's peculiar exegetical understanding of the Pauline doctrine of sin was inseparably connected with his Inner Religious Experiences, as is also evident from the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. While the superficial "Sawtheologians," in their systems tainted by the blasphemy of thought, imagined that man could at least actually (secundum substantiam facti)-grace, however, comes into consideration as a further "requirement"-fulfill the commandments of God by his own strength (II, 110), Luther's entire righteousness under the law had been put to shame by the one little commandment: "Do not let yourself be lusted after!" There first, as once with Paul (in Rom. 7, 7), sin in all its awfulness had stood before his soul. This was the Cerberus, the unconquerable Antaeus, with whom he wrestled (II, 144 ff.). Out of this struggle rose the inexpressible sighs which no one can utter, which only God can sympathize with (1:77). Two dangers threatened from this enemy. Either one makes enormous efforts to eradicate concupiscence, whose most dangerous form consists in the amor sui, the egoism that penetrates into religious life (I, 62): the success is then despair and fear of the judgment of God, before which one cannot stand (II, 102). Or else one seeks rest in the sacrament, which unfortunately acts only as a narcoticon: the result is then a more or less prominent carelessness, a carelessness in the face of newly approaching temptations (II, 178). In contrast, we must come to terms with the fact that we cannot eliminate concupiscence either by moral acrobatics or by sacramental magic, but must retain it. The soul remains attached to the bird's glue of the flesh as long as it is in the body, and only in death, when it can fly, is it finally freed by grace (II, 94). And this is no proof of the impotence of divine grace, but a wise institution of God. For thus the virtuosos of sanctification remain finely humble, learn to recognize that one does not reach the goal of sanctification in an instant-the convalescent who wants to get well quickly, quickly, gets relapses-and they learn to ask daily for the assistance of God's grace (II, 116. 102). The comfortable sacramental Christian, however, will be reminded by the constant presence of the original sinful desire that he is not called to rest, but to militia Dei, and must always be in readiness for battle against devils and the inward errors (II, 179). Thus Luther had also been compelled by his inner experiences to convince himself of the persistence of sin in the state of the born-again, and to state with the earnestness of the realist the darkening shadows in the life of the Christian. Further confirmation came to him from his reading of the mystics. The continuity of moral development had, after all, been clearly enough expressed by Bernard: "When you begin not to want to become better, you cease to be good" (II, 266). "He who does not always hasten to repent, says in effect that he has no need of repentance." "To stop in the way of God is to go backward; to progress is nothing else than to begin again and again" (II, 307). One may argue whether Luther's inner experience led him to Paul and mysticism, or whether he ran out of eyes on Paul and the mystics - in any case, here we have one of the Reformer's fundamental discoveries. The statement of the abiding sin in the born-again pulls the whole hitherto sacramental conception of grace out of the way.

the ground from under their feet. That type of Catholic sacramentalist whose religiousness has shrunk to the cultic, who can combine the highest devotion with the most frivolous way of life, is excluded from the educational character of divine grace. The alarming aberration of conscience: "sin is no longer there after Communion, so I need not be too anxious about any new entries in the book of guilt," can play no part here. For the sin remains, and forgiveness becomes legally valid only through the subsequent militia Dei! But spiritual acrobatics are also excluded by the statement that sin remains and thus that healing is only gradual. That monastic fabrication of extraordinary, eye-catching pious achievements, that virtuosity which finally degenerated into pure technique, takes a back seat to the inconspicuous but steady moral development. Therefore, already here in the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans - though it is only a flash - the earthly profession appears as the God-ordained form in which grace can educate us best and in which we can work on our inner man most perfectly. "A simple little mother is better able to serve God by bearing children, by humbly fulfilling the self-denying task of marriage, than another who performs great, sensational works" (II, 253). It is possible that here at the same time a word of Tauler's fell on fertile ground, according to which an agrarian who had already been farming for 40 years and asked himself whether he should retire to the monastic state was answered, "he should win his bread with his sweat and earn his noble, faithful blood in honor of it" (Tauler's Sermons, ed. Petri-Basel 1521, p. 48). This much is certain, that in accordance with that moral education of God which is averse to all peculiar conduct, instead of monkish asceticism as the form of moral life especially pleasing to God, Luther, in harmony with mysticism, puts the cross laid out by God in the natural destinies. Here the Christian is to learn to live to the will of his God! To praise and bless God when everything goes against the grain and saddens us - this is the mark of being in grace. To rejoice in tribulation and to mourn in joy is impossible for the flesh by its own powers (II, 186). Thus it is evident from the cross that grace is the antithesis of sin. If the characteristic of sin was "propria complacentia," egoistic concupiscence (II, 138), it is the characteristic of the state of grace when God's will on the cross pleases us and we say: eja, so it is mine, it serves me right, I have deserved it no other way, for I am a sinner (II, 70). Those who shun the cross are the real enemies of the cross, worse than the Turks: they are those who do not want to tell or do the truth to anyone, but to please and flatter everyone, to offend no one (II, 135). These are the "patres pacis," who want to get through the world as unscathed as possible (II, 286). But he has gone farthest who has suppressed egoistic concupiscence even in pious desires. One desires eternal blessedness as a matter of course. But this is impure piety. It is amor concupiscentiae - for in this one loves God not for his own sake, but only because he makes us blessed. This impure love must also be rooted out. Just as perfect love should prove itself in complete serenity in the face of death (II, 187), so it should be able to find itself in the will of God when God condemns us to hell. Only then, when one earnestly desires to go to hell, only then.

one can boast of having exorcised even the last spark of sinful selfishness (II, 218). Thus the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans already contains the program of the future also with regard to ethics. The psychological deepening, the penetration into the deep abysses of human sinfulness, as it came out of Luther's immersion in the heart struggles of the Apostle Paul, urged on the new paths. This prompted the letter of rejection of sacramentalism and monasticism. It drove to a renewed appreciation of the hitherto almost overlooked morality in earthly occupation and the cross that everyday life entails.

Braun's explanations of Luther's doctrine of predestination in this commentary seem somewhat scanty. Whether Braun has reproduced Luther's thoughts completely and thus also correctly? **Lic.** Braun writes p. 747 ff:

It is known from a remark of Melanchthon how Luther suffered in the monastery under the scruples about predestination. Romans 9, with its unfathomable riddles, was the stumbling block that often occupied his mind, even into the late years of the Reformation. While the "righteousness of God" and sin, those first two subjects of the Epistle to the Romans, are treated in the Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans in such a way that the solution of the knots is already clearly and definitely given, the same cannot be said of predestination. Luther is not yet out of the groping. Only reluctantly does the Reformer speak about it, because he himself feels that he has not yet penetrated to clarity. "I would not read about it if the order of the lecture (the chapter explanation) did not compel me. For this is strongest food. But I am small, in need of milk" (II, 226). About the great riddle of how the two can be reconciled: that God obliges everyone to righteousness, thus makes him responsible for his actions, and yet chooses only some, not all, we shall only receive enlightenment in eternity (II, 23). All questioning about these intricate contradictions flares back to the utterly incalculable counsel of God: "To whom it may, it may; to whom it may, it may." No one knows what he will have mercy on, and no one can be sure of it (II, 224). So there can be no question of certainty of salvation. Luther expressly remarks, following Rom. 8, 38 "certus sum" in the gloss: The apostle speaks only in his own person, because he was certain by special revelation that he was a vessel of election. But in general (lege communi) no one may be certain that he was chosen (1:81). It is possible to speak, as the scholastics did, of evident and infallible signs that one is chosen: above all, the fear that one is not chosen, and the terror that one has of the hidden judgment of God, and also the displeasure with oneself, speak in favor of this (II, 214. 249). But it is the preaching of these signs of grace that can make men secure again. And this security and carelessness, that all is well because one has grace, is rather a sign of God's wrath against man (II, 324). For this reason Luther considers the well-tried "royal way" of wavering between fear and hope to be the best: one should know and hate sin and thus enter into the fear of God and yet await God's mercy, that he may deliver us (II, 118). In what direction here lay the new, which only later came to him in full clarity, is evident from two remarks which, though they appear like a foreshadowing, are too lost to be more than such: He who with firm faith and hope-

If a person trusts in the conviction that he is a child of God, he is a child of God, because without the Holy Spirit no one can be a child of God. At the same time, reference is made to the well-known passage from St. Bernard: You must believe that your sins are forgiven (I, 73). And further the warning not to lose oneself in speculations about predestination, but first to cleanse the eyes of the heart in the contemplation of the wounds of Jesus Christ. The wounds of JEsu Christ alone are certain to us (II, 226). In the pursuit of these intimations lay the certainty of salvation.

Braun also addresses Luther's thoughts in this 1515 commentary on political, social, and ecclesiastical conditions, writing p. 749 ff:

Although in the silence of the monastery, Luther follows with a keen eye what is going on in the larger world. The Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans provides ample evidence of this and also solves the mystery of how the reformer could suddenly emerge with a full political and social program in his writing to the "Christian nobility of the German nation. It was not something hastily pulled together, but something long prepared, which he there presented in concise sentences to his dear Germans. The discussion of the ethical part of the Epistle to the Romans (from chapter 12 on) gave him already in 1515 a welcome opportunity to make critical remarks on public conditions, and he makes ample use of them. Even now he speaks ill of the lawyers. They are rich. Whence comes their wealth if not from bribery? Gifts are made to them to be repaid by usury. Such offsets are commonplace. The proverb of Domitius Romanus, "Why should I respect you as a prince, if you will not let me be a senator?" is common even now; but it is heathenish, unworthy of a Christian (II, 279. 285). How rare is a calm objective judgment at all! One decides according to personal sympathy or antipathy. This is clearly shown in Reuchlin's dealings with the Cologne people, against whom, by the way, he sharply rebukes their self-righteous anti-Semitism (II, 284. 261). He also has many complaints against the princes who suck their subjects dry, take away their goods, if not by force, but indirectly force them to do so by imposing disgrace and withdrawing their support in other cases. There are few princes to whom Augustine's words do not apply, "Quid sunt magna regna nisi magna latrocinia?" That pirate was perfectly right who answered Alexander the Great's reproach that he troubled the sea: "You trouble the whole world. I do it with a small ship, and therefore am called robber; thou with a whole fleet, and therefore art called emperor." Thus are princes thieves. The right of hunting, which they claim for themselves, is nothing but theft from the public. They are murderers too, and that as many as are the authors of unjust wars. And they do it all the more rude because they have no judge over them (II, 22. 30). Above all, he criticizes them for completely disregarding the basic Christian virtue of humility in their political measures. They ruthlessly pursue their personal right, while as Christians they should say to themselves: even if I am in the right in the present case, I am nevertheless so much in the wrong in many other points that I should patiently bear the one legal disadvantage as a deserved chastisement of God. So should Duke George have acted in his dispute with Friesland, so should the Bishop of Brandenburg have acted, and it would also have been good for Pope Julius II. if a

would have advised him, "Most Holy Father, the Roman Church is not so holy that she does not deserve worse than the Venetians are doing to her. Yield it; it is the will of God." But that one says, "No, no, we will pursue our right." "But thou, Prince Frederick (the Wise), art guarded by a good angel, if thou knowest this. How much injustice has come upon thee, with how just cause thou couldst make war; thou toleratedst it, wast calm, I know not whether more from honest recognition of sin or from fear of temporal harm" (II, 272). The application of the mystical principles of serenity in public life may seem to us too broad! They are, however, limited by the fact that they apply only in one's own case. The prince must endure personal legal disadvantages; on the other hand, he must not tolerate that his subjects are wronged. Here he must be judge in God's stead (II, 275). Luther, by the way, is not blind in his reverence for his sovereign. He finds fault with him, as with the "Officials," that they sometimes cannot be found when they are approached in a matter. They allow themselves to be excused for being busy with other things, with prayer or worship, while they should be there precisely for what God sends their way (II, 287). It is understandable, however, that Luther's main interest was focused on ecclesiastical conditions. In his position as Provincial Vicar he probably had the opportunity to form a wider view and a more accurate judgment of them than would have been possible for him from his monastic cell. Practice often corrects theory. Thus it can also be observed in Luther that life did not permit him the unconditional implementation of the ideal of humility. He calls it a foolish humility to make oneself common to all as superior of the order and to step out of familiar footing with the subordinates. In this way the authority of the office conferred by God diminishes. Therefore, if one maintains respect, he need not immediately become a tyrant. Majestas and humilitas are needed for the exercise of office, and accordingly the subordinate must look up to the superior with fear and love (II, 3.4). This respect, which Luther shows in principle to ecclesiastical superiors - it may be in the same way that he demands obedience to secular authorities who abuse their power (inordinatae potestates) for the sake of their divine authority (I, 116) - does not prevent the Reformer from making himself the mouthpiece of the complaints against the "prostati". At least the secular authorities are better off than the ecclesiastical ones. The latter at least uphold morality. They are indifferent to the morals of the people, and the only things they care about are the liberties, privileges, and rights of the church. No wonder, since they themselves are steeped in vice. Even a Toller would have to be upset at this perverse world, in which an ambitious, avaricious, or voluptuous bishop harasses (fatigare) a layman with all the curses he can muster for the sake of half a florene. The children in the alley know of these conditions; so often do the scandals repeat themselves. These prelates resemble the high priests whom Paul calls whitewashed walls, who sit and judge the transgressors of the law, while they themselves are the worst of lawbreakers (Acts 23:3). If they had a judge over them, they would at least be more careful (II, 300. 31). So also Pope Julius II raged with fire and sword against the Venetians for the sake of worldly things. But no sin was the moral rottenness of the Curia! Already Bernard complains about such bishops, who take little care of great things, that is, of pastoral care, and great care of small things, that is, of earthly things.

(II, 301). What a distance, in this respect, if one compares the present with apostolic times! In those days we had worthy priests, and they had to pay all taxes to the State; now we have unworthy priests, and they enjoy all kinds of privileges and exemptions. At that time the clergy were popular with the laity, although the latter led them to poverty, to suffering, and to death; now the laity are aping the clergy, and at bottom one cannot blame them when they say: beneficium propter officium! Rights and riches are to be granted to the clergy, but only if there are corresponding considerations in return. By such, however, they certainly understand more than the coldly muttered canonical prayers of the Horen, of which the apostle knows nothing as yet, while on the other hand he knows many things as a priestly duty, of which one has no idea now. Let not the complaints of the common man be slight. Formerly they were too ignorant to be easily reassured, but now they know the "mysteries" of our iniquity (II, 300). The sad thing is that today people consider as the core of piety things that are very much on the periphery. Church and organ buildings, religious pomp, administration of church goods, money management-these are the sum total of religion in the eyes of contemporaries. Of plain, simple charity they want to know nothing (II, 275). This is a religion of one's own invention, not according to the commandments of God, tailored to the base instincts of the multitude, who are impressed only by the extraordinary, the works of the saints in the legends, which one then seeks to copy as well and as badly as one can. As to what each one ought to do according to his station and profession, one asks nothing (II, 243. 20). The fatal thing is that one now regards the whole ceremonial service as necessary for salvation. One need not yet be a Pighard who deletes these externals altogether; one may, after all, observe fasts and feasts, etc., out of obedience and love. But when one sees how the Christianity of our contemporaries is absorbed in them, neglecting faith and love, and how the people think that without these things one cannot be blessed, and how even the clergy think that when they have filled the church on Sundays with a great noise, and have finished the mass with the sound of the organ and all kinds of pomp, they can go home with confidence, then one would advise the abolition of fasts and many feast days. At the very least, the bishops should, if at all possible, limit this practice to the smallest degree (II, 315. 317). Especially the canonical Horen are in great need of reform. He sharply criticizes those benefactors who allocate large sums of money to the monasteries on condition that and how often they pray for the salvation of their souls. Such endowments are folly, for it is not determined what is to be prayed for, but only that much is to be prayed for. Prayers cannot be bought. And with the old foundations, which had God's glory in view, they cannot be compared, because they aim only at private benefit, at one's own salvation (II, 291). And further, the prescribed prayers are more a hindrance than a furtherance. They are prayed down without the heart being in them, and one thereby becomes careless. For one thinks he has done his duty after completing his stint. Prayer is rather a matter in which the soul must be completely concentrated, and must not be pursued so superficially as the lawyers put it, who are content if the prayers of the Horen are "read" or "spoken." The ancient Fathers are right: "Non est labor sicut orare Deum!" (II, 288).

Lic. Braun concludes his article in the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift" as follows:

These remarks, even if they are not yet in a systematic context, but scattered here and there, make clear to us the path that Luther took. Without knowledge of the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, it could seem as if Luther, the humble monastic brother who was still able to write the submissive letter to Pope Leo X, was only pushed onto the path of harsh criticism by his opponents. But we now see how Luther had long before broken with the papist nature. It is not as if step by step the reform had been forced from him, but he foresaw long beforehand how it must come. And so his reticence was not a lack of insight, but wise self-control. A trifle may illustrate this. Everyone knows how Luther, in the Theses, puts into the mouth of a layman the captious question: why does the Pope, who bestows rich graces in indulgences for money, not do so free of charge, out of pure Christian love? and only cites it as proof of how the people think! In the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in the lecture which did not get beyond the academic lecture-room and the minds of the students, Luther himself reproaches the pope and the bishops for being "super omnem crudelitatem crudeles," for not giving away for free what they received for free. They are deceivers and deceive the people (II, 243). This is far more vigorous language than that of the theses. How Luther conceived of his work of reform, that he did not make that incisive criticism of the old, surviving, out of pure air of destruction, may be corroborated in conclusion by a quotation: "I adjure you not to imitate me in what I say under the pressure of pain and duty. For the application of practical life from the doctrine which is delivered serves for understanding. Especially since I sanctify the Magisterium with apostolic authority, it is for me to say where I see wrong, even in the higher authorities" (II, 301).

In his article in the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" (column 969 ff.) Lic. Braun reproduces several striking sentences from the newly discovered commentary on the theme of the Epistle to the Romans, on merit, sacrament, active grace, Jmputation grace, profession, etc., which we also let follow here:

"The theme of the Epistle to the Romans: On Rom. 1, 3: **Hic magnus aperitur introitus in sacrae Scripturae intelligentiam, sc. quod tota de Christo sit intelligenda**. (I, 4). The summa and chief purpose of the apostle in this epistle is to destroy all our own righteousness and wisdom, and to raise up again, increase, and magnify (that is, to make it known how they are found, how they are many and great) the sins and folly which were not (that is, were not considered by us as existing because of such righteousness), and then finally to show that, in order to destroy them truly, Christ and his righteousness are necessary. (I, 3.)

"Merits: all virtue, wisdom, and righteousness must be concealed, buried, not shown, according to the example of the likeness of Christ, who so emptied Himself that He utterly hid His power, wisdom, and goodness, preferring weakness, folly, and

Ruggedness proved. Thus he who is mighty, wise, and kind, must possess this as if he did not possess it (II, 13). Even good works, because the tinder of lust and sensuality is resisted, are not done with the intensity and purity required by the law, since they are not done from all the powers, but only from the powers of the spirit under the resistance of the powers of the flesh. Therefore we also sin in doing good, unless God through Christ covered this imperfection for us and did not impute it (II, 123). Even if some do good works outwardly, they do it for fear of punishment, or love of money, or fame, or some other creature, not with will and inward joy; and so it comes to pass, that when the outward man is occupied with good works, the inward man teems with contrary lusts and desires. For if it were permitted with impunity, or if he knew that he would not gain glory or satisfaction by it, he would refrain from the good and do the bad like the others. What difference is there, then, in the sight of God, between him who really does evil, and him who wills to do it, though he does not in fact do it for fear of punishment, or for love of a temporal advantage? But in this respect the latter is the worst of all, because he thinks such external righteousness sufficient, and opposes those who teach the internal, and, when accused, defends himself or feels himself not struck, while yet he is accused on that account, not because he does the good, but because he does it not from a simple-minded heart, and does not also mend his will, with which he desires the opposite (II, 73). Some are all too just, all too God-seekers, so that they are uncorrectable in their sense. As the comedian (Terence) says: "Some go so far with their intelligence that they become stupid about it and: '**summa justitia saepe summa stultitia**, indeed the highest justice is the highest injustice, if it is obstinately asserted and one does not yield to the adversary.' Hence the popular saying: 'Weiß leut narrn gröblich' (II, 76). Very seldom does it happen that one confesses to be a sinner. For how can one admit that he is a sinner, if he will not even bear a word against himself, his deeds, his plans, but immediately rises up to dispute, and does not even confess with his mouth his error, but asserts that he is true and a benefactor, and that he is unjustly resisted and falsely accused? But when he is compelled to suffer anything, he becomes quite angry, and wearies all with complaints that injustice is done to him (II, 69). If shame, injustice, harm, sickness befall you, and you say, I do not deserve it, why should I bear it? It happens to me unjustly, I am innocent - do you not thereby deny that you are a sinner, and resist God? . . . But if thou sayest in such cases: Eia, so it is mine, it befalls me with all right, gladly I confess it,

because I am indeed a sinner, in thee have I sinned, that thy works might be justified, thy words, true and righteous God; thou art not mistaken, for as thou by these penalties dost set me forth as a sinner, so it is; I am - behold, that is to say: 'Against thee have I sinned, and done evil in thee, that thou mightest be justified in thy words'" (II, 70). If we look carefully at ourselves, we shall always find in us at least the remnants of the flesh, on account of which we are inclined to refer everything to ourselves, and are slow to do good, inclined to do evil. For if these remnants of sin were not in us, and we sought God in a pure way, man would soon be dissolved, and his soul would fly to God. But the fact that he does not fly away is a sign that he is still clinging to the glue of the flesh and will remain so until he is redeemed by the grace of God, which can only be hoped for in death. In the meantime one must always sigh with the apostle: "Who will deliver me from the body of this death?" (II, 94).

"Sacrament: he who looks only to the sins of fact, and is concerned only for their purification, becomes quick and overconfident and secure, because he is convinced that he will be purified by the sacrament and confession, and so goes along without fear, and is further unconscious of any sin (II, 117). Hence there is so much backsliding in the Church after confessions. For the persons concerned do not know that they must first be justified, but think themselves justified, and so come to fall through their certainty without any intervention of the devil (II, 111). Under these circumstances, either I have never rightly discerned the matter, or the scholastic theologians have not been clear enough about sin and grace, since they suppose that original sin, like actual sin, is simply removed, as if it could be done away with in a moment, as darkness is done away with by light. . . . On the basis of this (false) opinion, I could not see how I should put myself on an equal footing with other sinners and how I should prefer no one, since I had confessed; for then I believed that everything had been removed and destroyed, even inwardly (II, 108). This foolish opinion, with the most pernicious lies, has brought it about that the baptized and absolved, thinking that they were without sin, were assured of the righteousness they had attained, laid their hands slackly in their laps, because they were no longer conscious of any sin which they should have fought and swept out with sighs and tears, by lamentations and labor. But there is sin left in the spiritual man, for the exercise of grace, for the humbling of pride, for the suppression of presumption. For he that striveth not diligently to sweep it out hath it still, though he do no more damnable sin. For we are not called to rest, but to labour against our inclinations. And these would not be without fault (for they are sins indeed, and ver-

dammable), if she did not not count God's mercy. But he does not count it against those who struggle manfully with their faults, invoking the grace of God. For this reason let him who goes to confession not think that he is laying aside his burdens in order to live quietly, but let him be convinced that after laying aside the burden he is entering upon the war service (**militia**) of God and taking upon himself another burden for God against the devil and his lap sins. If he does not know this, he will quickly backslide. He who does not intend to fight afterwards, how can he ask to be absolved and enrolled in the roll of the militia of **Christ**? (II, 178 f.).

"Active Grace: Some the devil forces by foolish work to try to be pure and holy without any sin, and as often as they feel that they are sinning and something evil is afoot, he terrifies them with judgment and wearies their conscience so that they almost despair. For he directs his attack according to the inclinations of each. And because these glow and burn after righteousness, it is not easy to counsel them to the contrary. So he begins to support them in their resolution to get rid of all evil desire as quickly as possible. If they cannot do this, he makes them sad, despondent, fainthearted, despairing, and troubled in conscience. There is nothing left, then, but to remain in our sins and, hoping in the mercy of God, to ask to be delivered from them. As the convalescent who hastens the healing too much is sure to have a relapse all the worse. So we must be healed gradually, and endure some infirmities always. It is enough that sin displeases us, though it does not entirely disappear. For Christ bears them all, and if they displease us, they are no longer ours, but His, and conversely His righteousness ours (II, 102). On Rom. 12, 2 (**sed reformamini**): This is said in favor of progress. For he speaks to those who have already begun to be Christians. Their life does not consist in resting, but in moving from good to better, as a sick person progresses from sickness to health. Hence St. Bernard says: 'If you cease to want to be better, you cease to be good.' For it is of no use to the tree that it should flourish and blossom, if it does not progress from blossoming to bearing fruit. Therefore many perish in the blossoming. For as there are five degrees in natural things: Non-being, Becoming, Being, Action, Suffering, or in other words, Deprivation, Matter, Form, Activity, and Suffering, according to Aristotle (Categories), so also in the spirit: Non-being - man in sins, Becoming - justification, Being - righteousness; then one must act and live righteously; lastly be perfected by suffering. And these five are always in motion in man. And each can be stated in man - for between the two stations, non-being and suffering,

always run those other three. Becoming, being, acting - through the new birth he is in the transition from sin to righteousness, and thus from non-being through becoming to being, then he acts righteously; and from this new being he progresses - thereby this becomes non-being - (through suffering) through to another new being, and from this again to another. Therefore man is always in non-being, always in becoming or potentiality and matter, and always in action. Thus Aristotle philosophizes quite correctly, but they do not recognize him. Always man is in non-being, in becoming, in being, always in deprivation, in potentiality, in action-always in sin, always in justification, in righteousness, that is, always a sinner, always a penitent, always righteous (II, 266).

"Imputation grace: God wills to save us not by an inward, but by an outward righteousness and wisdom approaching from without, not that which comes and is born of ourselves, but which comes to us from elsewhere, not that which originates on earth, but which comes from heaven. Therefore this outward and external righteousness must be learned, and first our own and inward righteousness must be plucked out (II, 2). The heart of the believer in Christ, when it has to bear witness against itself on account of its evil deeds, immediately turns to Christ and says, He has done enough, He is righteous, He is my defence, He died for me, He has made His righteousness mine and my sin His. But if he hath made my sin his, then have I none, and am I free. On the other hand, if he has made his righteousness mine, I am righteous with the same righteousness as he. My sin cannot consume him, but is consumed in the infinite abyss of his righteousness, which is God himself, highly praised forever. And so God is greater than our heart. The defender is infinitely greater than the accuser. God is the defender, the heart the accuser (II, 44). The saints are always sinners within, therefore they are always justified without. The hypocrites, on the other hand, are inwardly always righteous, therefore outwardly they are always sinners. Inwardly I call how we find in ourselves, in unfar eyes, according to our estimation, but outwardly how we are with God and in his consideration. Therefore we are righteous, if we are not righteous from ourselves nor from works, but only from God's **reputatio.** For this is not in us, nor in our power: so also our righteousness is not in us, nor in our power. . . . But inwardly we are sinners by virtue and from the nature of the relation; for if we find ourselves righteous only because God regards us as such, so we are not so because we live or work. But inwardly and of ourselves we are always ungodly. . . . . Whereas the hypocrites, because they are inwardly...

are just, by virtue and from the nature of the relation outwardly unjust (that is, in the estimation of God). . . . God is wonderful in his saints, inasmuch as they are both just and unjust to him. And God is wonderful in the hypocrites, inasmuch as they are both unjust and just to him. For while the saints have their sin always before their eyes, and ask for justice from God, which he gives according to fine mercy, they are counted righteous by God for this sake. So in truth they are unrighteous to themselves, but to God they appear righteous because of their confession of sin; in reality sinners, but righteous in the estimation of the merciful God, ignorantly righteous and knowingly unrighteous; in reality sinners, but righteous in hope. Therefore it is said: 'Blessed are they whose iniquity is forgiven, and whose sins are covered' (Ps. 32). . . . Wonderful and sweetest mercy of God, who has us at once as sinners and not as sinners! At the same time sin abideth and abideth not. Likewise wonderful and stern wrath, having the ungodly at once unrighteous and righteous. Their sin is removed and not removed (II, 104 f.).

"Profession: what will the haughty man, who has done much in his life, answer, when God prefers to him the least married female: Behold, she hath served me only by bearing children; and this her work do I prefer to thine, and it pleaseth me? What will he answer? For all works have but so much worth as they are esteemed with God. But now he can accept the least and smallest, and reject the greatest and most glorious. Shall we not therefore do good? Let that be far off! Only in humility should it be done, and then God will not reject it; therefore those act foolishly nowadays who heap up many good and great works according to their own sense, and think that they are good because they are burdensome and numerous and seem good to them. In vain, in vain effort! Only the works of humility are good, which those do not know (p. 253).

"Cross: Let no man doubt that he is a non-Christian, yea, a Turk and an enemy of Christ, if he evade temptations. There are two kinds of enemies to the cross of Christ: the first the gross, the other the subtle. The gross are they who would forcibly do away with the cross of Christ, and thrust against it with all their horns. These are they who seek to avenge themselves on the offending party, and will not be quiet until they are avenged. And they fall to much malice, hatred, diminutions, vituperations, gloating, and anger at their neighbor's happiness. But the enemies are those who leave the cross by flight, that is, who do not want to tell or do the truth to anyone, but to please everyone, to caress and flatter everyone, to offend no one, and for this reason withdraw into solitude. And this is what Gal. 6 means, where it says: "Those who still want to please the flesh force you to be circumcised.

only so that they do not have to endure the persecution of the cross of Christ (II, 134 f.)

"Reformation: Not those are the best Christians who are very learned and read much and abound in books. For all their books and learning is a letter and death to the soul. Rather, the best are those who do with complete free will what they read in books and teach others. But they do not do it with free will unless they have love through the Holy Spirit. Therefore there is much to be feared for our age, since by continual accumulation of literature we obtain very learned men, but very unlearned Christians (II, 167). The philosophers direct their attention so much to the present (**praesentia**) of things, that they speculate only on the what and how (**quidditates et qualitates**) of them; but the apostle (Rom. 8, 19) directs our eyes from the sight of present things, from their sense and accidents, to them themselves, so far as they are future. For he does not speak of the 'being' or the 'action' of the creature, of its 'doing,' 'suffering,' and 'moving,' but with a new and wonderful theological term he speaks of the 'expectation of the creature,' so that just thereby he directs attention not to the creature itself, but to what that creature expects and hopes for. But oh, how deeply and injuriously do we cling to definitions and conceptualizations! How stuck we are in foolish opinions in metaphysics! When will we become wise, and see that we are losing our so precious time in vain studies, and neglecting what is better? We are always busy in such a way that what Seneca says of us is true: "We do not know what is necessary because we learn what is superfluous; indeed, we do not know what is wholesome because we learn what is perishable. I, at least, believe that I owe the Lord the service of barking against philosophy and counseling the Scriptures. For if another did this, who did not have this exact knowledge, one would be afraid and would not believe him. But I have consumed myself in it in many years, and in as many have convinced myself that it is a vain and lost study. Therefore I exhort you, as well as I can, that you settle these studies quickly, and be bent only on them, not that you preserve and defend them, but as one learns bad arts to destroy them, and errors to refute them, so must we also reject these studies, or at least acquire them only in such a way as to acquire the method, the manner of speaking (**modus loquendi**) of those with whom we have to deal. For it is time for us to engage in other studies, and to learn JESUS Christ, and Him crucified (II, 198 f.). If a layman who hates the clergy (we all complain today that the laity are the enemies of the clergy, but we do not say why. For why were they not in former times the apostles

and prophets, who were to them guides to poverty, suffering, and death, and brought them all manner of affairs in temporal life? Therefore, if any one should say: To you clerics the benefits are given for the sake of the duties (officer, as the rule says: beneficium **propter officium**!), then those immediately refer in reply to their murmuring of prayers and nothing else. The canonical horen are priestly duties, which are coldly enough murmured down, nay, limited and abrogated by dispensations, while the Apostle, when describing the priest, does not even mention of prayer. But what he mentions, no one mentions to perform it (II, 299). I know not, it almost seems to me, that the secular powers do their duty happier and better today than the ecclesiastical ones, because they punish severely theft and murder, except that they furnish the sentences with their devious juridical reasons. But the ecclesiastical ones, apart from condemning those who touch the liberties, privileges, and rights of the church, do nothing but nourish rather than punish ostentation, ambition, lusts, and quarrels, so that it is perhaps safer if the temporal affairs of the clergy were also under state authority; for not only do they not prevent the unlearned, the stupid, and the empty-headed from gaining access to the sacred office, but they still promote them to higher places. Knowing, seeing, and feeling, they corrupt the church by elevating vile men, and yet they sit in judgment on their enemies, to whom they give every occasion for spite, and whom they compel rather than incite to hatred. Thus those whitewashed walls sit judging transgressors by the laws, while they themselves are the ungodly transgressors, unconcerned how they stand blameless, and occupied only how they reprove others, stern censors of others' righteousness, and corrupters of their own righteousness. Had they others to fear, how much more would they be careful in everything! (II, 300). If the liberty were given that fasting, prayers, obedience, church service were placed in the personal free discretion and conscience of every one, so that he might do as he pleased, guided only by love to God, I believe that in one year almost all churches and altars would be abandoned. If a mandate went forth that no priest, unless he wished, should be without a wife, with tonsure, in prescribed dress, and obliged to the canonical prayers of the Horen, how many, I ask you, would you find who chose that state in which they are now? Would it not be as the proverb says: "If it come to the conscience? Ask thyself, when thou prayest, offerest, goest to the choir, or doest any thing else, whether, if it were at thy liberty, thou wouldst do all these things, and thou wilt find who thou art with God. For if thou wouldst not, if thou couldst freely choose, thou dost and dost not perform, because thou art a slave and a hired servant. But there are some,

who, knowing this, sit down in the corner and say: I take comfort in my good will (**intentio**) and make a virtue of necessity. The devil laughs at this and says: 'Smuggle you, libs heresy, we will have geßte habenn.' Then he gets up, goes into the choir and prays, saying: 'Sih eulichen, wie schon biftu, haftu nu pfawen feern?' If I knew not (according to the fable) that thou art an ass, I would take thee for a lion, so thou shalt cry out; but yet thou art covered with the lion's skin, thou art known by thine ears.' Then he is wearied, and counts the leaves and verses, whether the prayer is soon at an end, and consoles himself with this: Scotus concludes that the **intentio virtualis** (the will as intention) is sufficient, and the **intentio actualis** (the will to act) is not required. Then the devil says: O well, right, only be confident! (II, 321). I adjure you that you do not imitate me in this, which I say under the pressure of pain and duty. For understanding is served by the application of practical life to the doctrine which is delivered. Especially since I lead the Magisterium with apostolic authority, it behooves me to say where I see wrong, be it even in the higher authorities! (II, 301)."

Adolf Jülicher judges Luther's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: "Before Luther, no interpreter, perhaps no reader, had ever grasped the essentials of the Epistle to the Romans so clearly, felt the religious intuitions, especially the thoughts about justice, law, predestination, so vividly, and proclaimed them so warmly and movingly in the language of his time. Who does not envy the students who heard the Epistle to the Romans interpreted at that time in Wittenberg? We still have a few copies of the text, which Luther dictated and combined glosses and slogans; in the Weimar edition, the dictation will also be printed. But one need only compare the length of the lecture, which extended over a year and a half, with the brevity of that dictation on the one hand, and with the volume of Luther's lecture notes, now recovered, on the other, to see that that lecture must have offered an expansion rather than a thin excerpt from Luther's notes." "The commentary, in spite of its scholarly form, is so thoroughly personal, a kind of **Confessiones,** an exposition of the struggles and moods and postulates which have been stirred up in fine interior by the force of Paul's words. The revival of a great man in one 1500 years younger, the lowering of the thousandfold barriers that separate the two, this is observed so singularly in this commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, because Luther wrote it down only for himself, because no other purpose here interferes with that of holding the great conquests. ... He spoke powerfully and not like the scribes. "

F. B.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**Refutation of the paper edited by Allwardt**: "The Present Doctrine of the Missouri Synod of the Eternal Election of God." Such is the title of a pamphlet which Father J. F. F. Gerike "committed to print at the request of the Lebanon Mixed Special Conference," and which is now published in a second, enlarged edition by the **Concordia Publishing House,** and can be had for 20 cents. Of Allwardt's pamphlet the previous year the Ohio "Church Newspaper" wrote: "Quickly the first edition was sold out . . . . That the second edition had to be made so quickly proves that D. Allwardt's writing is doing a valuable service." How did this come about? In the preface to his "Refutation" Fr. Gerike says: "D. Allwardt saw to it that his booklet also found its way into our congregations, and so of necessity we had to make a stand." "Now D. Allwardt's booklet has appeared in a second edition and, strangely enough, has been sent free of charge to almost every Missourian pastor." If now Allwardt continues to send his pamphlet unsolicited and free of charge, new editions of the same are likely to become more and more necessary, and according to the logic of the Ohio "church paper" the proof of the excellence of this pamphlet could thereby at the same time be increased ad infinitum. But one consequence of Ohio's tactics for propagandizing their dubious wares was that much demand necessitated a second edition of Gerike's "Refutation." Of fine writing Gerike remarks: "Apart from anything else, this refutation should also have the benefit of making opponents see that the Missouri and Wisconsin bush pastors do not march at the command of St. Louis or Wauwatosa, but can think and act for themselves independently on the basis of the Word of God." Anyone who has read Gerike's writing, however, must admit: these "bush pastors" not only have the courage of their own convictions and initiative, but they are also fully equal to the Ohio doctor with his historical, exegetical and dogmatic sophistries. The "Ev.-Luth. Gemeindeblatt" of the Lutheran Synod of S. Catharine said in its number of August 1, 1909, of Allwardt's pamphlet: "The reading of the ecclesiastical and theological papers from both camps is not sufficient" [to orient oneself about the dispute between Ohio and Missouri]; "one looks around for a safe guide. There this little paper furnishes us with an estimable contribution." Certainly, to find the Calvinism which Ohio charges Missouri with, the ecclesiastical and theological papers of the Missouri Synod are not sufficient; for this it requires special Ohioan efforts and such "estimable contributions" as D. Allwardt and other apostate Missourians furnish. If any one wishes to be convinced of this, let him read P. Gerike's excellent "Refutation." The second edition of this writing has been enlarged especially by the proof that it is a falsehood taken out of the air when Allwardt claims that in 1877 Walther changed his previous doctrine of election in regard to faith into an election to faith, and that this change of Walther compelled Schmidt, Allwardt and others to ring the storm bell against "New Missouri". From the report of the Northern Assembly

District in Milwaukee in 1868, at which not only D. Walther, but also Schmidt and Allwardt were present, Gerike brings quotations which clearly show that Walther already then led the same teaching as in 1877, without Schmidt and Allwardt protesting against it. Gerike also furnishes proof that Schmidt, even after he had read the report of 1877, did not protest against Walther, for instance, but in a postcard of May 8, 1878, applied for a professorship in St. Louis next to D. Walther, and that the same Schmidt, when he had not been elected professor to St. Louis by the General Synod, wrote to Walther on January 2, 1879: "I can no longer take part here. ... I must be silent no longer," etc. For those who wish to inform themselves as to what Missouri- teaches, and how the apostate Missourians in the Ohio Synod slander us, we recommend Gerike's "Refutation." F. B.

**Ohio Tactics.** Gerike, in his "Rebuttal," asserts that D. Allwardt saw to it that his truth-distorting and Missouri-slandering writing also found its way into congregations of the Synodical Conference, indeed that it was sent, unsolicited, almost free of charge to every Missouri pastor. That these statements are correct is also evident from the fact that the ***Lutheran Standard of*** the Ohio Synod in in its issues of September 4 and 25, asks its readers to send gifts to D. Allwardt so that he may send his pamphlet to all the German **pastors of America.**

could. This shows at the same time that the ***Standard*** also considers Allwardt's tactics to be entirely in order and promotes them. It therefore touches one's own heart when one then again in the same ***Standard*** (4 December

1909) says: "**Perhaps if we and Missouri had argued less and spent more time in earnest prayer and kindly patience with one another, we might not have drifted so far apart. And perhaps if we would now talk less harshly about each other, and would pray on, we might yet get together.**" Certainly, if the Ohioans have determined, as seems to be the case, to continue **by means fair or foul the** present system of agitation and distortion against Missouri and the Synodical Conference, all prospects of peace, and even of negotiation for concord and peace, are hopeless. And how would Luther, if he were alive, judge of D. Allwardt's practices favored by the ***Standard?*** Luther writes: "To a good work belongs a certain divine profession, and not one's own devotion, which one calls one's own suggestions. It becomes sour to those who have a certain calling from God, that they begin and accomplish something good, although God is with them and with them: what then should the senseless fools do, who want to get there without a calling, seeking their own vain honor and glory! As then it is not otherwise possible, whoever undertakes anything without God's calling, that he must seek fine honor of his own; for he is God himself, teaches himself what is to be done, may God's and fine word nothing to it." "For he that breaketh in uncalled of himself cometh not for any other cause, but to strangle and to kill, Joh. 10:10. So also our Lord giveth no blessing, happiness, and salvation to teachers, who appear without proper calling and command from themselves. And even if they sometimes bring something good and right to the market, they still create no benefit.

Nor counsel with it. Just as our red-blooded spirits also lead the doctrine of faith in their mouths, and yet do nothing fruitful with it; for out of this alone is directed all their trouble, labor, care, and diligence, that they may only persuade the people of their erroneous **opiniones** and articles." "Here perhaps thou speakest to me (Luther): Why then do you teach with your books all over the world, since you alone are a preacher in Wittenberg? Answer: I have never liked to do it, nor do I like to do it yet; but I was forced and driven into such an office in the first place, since I had to become a doctor of the Holy Scriptures without my thanks. . . . Though I am not such a doctor, yet I am a called preacher, and may well teach mine own with writings. Whether others have also **desired** such writings of mine and **asked** me for them, I am obliged to do so, for I have neither intruded upon myself with them nor desired or asked anyone to read them; Just as other pious pastors and preachers write more books and neither prevent nor force anyone to read them, and also teach and run with them in all the world, and yet do not sneak like loose, unappointed boys into foreign offices without the knowledge and will of the pastors, but have a certain office and command that drives and forces them." "And if thou couldst save the whole world with one sermon, and hast not the command, let it stand; for thou shalt break the right Sabbath, and shall not please God." "I have often said it, and still say it, I would not take the world's good for my doctorate. For indeed I should at last despair and despair in the great and heavy thing that is upon me, if I had begun it as a lurker without profession and command." "Let the sneak prove beforehand that he is a prophet or teacher in **the** church where he comes, and who has commanded him such a ministry **there, and then let him be** heard according to St. Paul's teaching. If he does not prove it, let him run away to the devil, who sent him and commanded him to steal a strange preaching office in a church, where he does not belong as a hearer or disciple, but as a prophet and master." (Walther's Pastorale, pp. 23 ff. and 312.) The Ohioan way of selling their wares strongly reminds one of the tactics of Bucer and the later cryptocalvinists in their unclean fight against Luther and his teaching. F. B.

**From the General Council.** 1st The Synod of New York, formed the previous year by uniting the New Jersey Synod, New York Synod, Hartwick Synod, and Frankean Synod, and now numbering 130 members, held its first meeting in October. No hosts were used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In its number of October 28, the ***Lutheran*** also condemns today's worldly dancing as

sinful and demoralizing. The seminary at Mount Airy has enriched its collection of ecclesiastical antiquities with the choir robe once worn (for the last time in January 1776) by Fr. Peter Mühlenberg (later General). The gift came from the Henkel family in Virginia. 4 The ***Lutheran expresses*** his joy that Roman priests are

The Lutheran seems not to notice that all this is only in the papacy. The ***Lutheran,*** however, does not seem to notice that all this in the papacy only

as a means to the end of extending papal rule. It is essential to anti-Christianity that it fights Christianity under the mask of piety. The same paper (p. 878) gives the contents of an address delivered at Oakland, Cal. by Father Swickard, against the denial of hell, in a Presbyterian pulpit there. The editor of the ***Lutheran*** remarks: "**In that great city of dwindling faith and loose morals-in spite of the shaking-up it had not long ago-there was not a pastor who dared to lift his voice in defense of the old faith, except the Rev. W. R. Swickard of our church, whose reply we, in the main, reprint.**" From the fact that other pastors, including Lutheran pastors, did not respond to the ungodly chatter in the Presbyterian: Church, the ***Lutheran*** concludes that they did not **dare**. Thus bad logic

for slander. D. Nicum, 58 years old, died on November 1. He repeatedly reported on the Missouri Synod and the Dispute over the Doctrine of Grace, anonymously in German newspapers. His reports, however, were subjective and lacked objective historical truth. 7) ***The Young Lutheran's Companion,*** the English

Sheet of the Augustana Synod, in its number of November 13, says of "**United Thanksgiving Services": "The idea is a beautiful one - all the citizens of one town or locality assembling as nearly as may be in one place to render grateful thanks to the one same God**!" What according to Scripture is unionism, the above sheet calls a beautiful thought. 8. it refers well to members of the General Council and General Synod when the Reading "Church Journal" (p. 366) writes: "It is against right confessional fidelity for Lutheran pastors and laymen to take part in Sunday School conventions, such as that recently held in Harrisburg. It is also to be regretted that more is expected from the interdenominational lay mission movement in Philadelphia than from regular, confessional preaching of the Word and pastoral work." 9 The November 11 ***Lutheran*** says of the United States, "**This is neither a French nor a Chinese nation, but one that holds by the Book and the Day. We recognize no right on the part of the wane merchants to break down the American Sunday in order to save $150,000. We are not ready to auction off the Ten Commandments to the highest bidder**." What the ***Lutheran*** opposes is right; what is wrong is but the reasoning; for Sunday is not commanded by God. 10. In the same number the ***Lutheran***, of the Orthodox Church of Russia, says: "**Both the Anatolian and the Russian churches, Orthodox as they claim to be, 'religious' as their adherents are outwardly, are so much given to ignorance, ceremonialism, and hagiolatry (worship of saints), that they deserve to be called by a Lutheran bishop, 'The fossilized infancy of Christianity.**'" The ***Lutheran*** hopefully does not believe

The same paper writes: "As Dr. Krauth has well said: 'The Lutheranism of this country cannot be a mere feeble echo of any nationalized species of Lutheranism. The same paper writes: "**As Dr. Krauth has well said: 'The Lutheranism of this country cannot be a mere feeble echo of any nationalized species of Lutheranism. ... It must be conformed in accordance with its own principles to its new home, bringing hither its priceless experiences in the old world, to apply them to the living present in the new**.'" How is this to be understood? It sounds alarming when the ***Lutheran*** continues:

"**It is the question as to how what is richest and best in the nationalistic mode of apprehending and expressing the common faith may be retained in the, final American Lutheranism that is to be.**" And What does it mean, When the ***Lutheran*** goes on to write, "**But the chief thing we as Lutherans need to be concerned about is that we bring together into one lens the separated rays of our nationalistic rainbow Lutheranism and send them forth into the future as one grand beam of white light**" ? Are these phrases, or does the ***Lutheran*** have something specific in mind?
thought of? Why does he not specify specifically what this "main body" that we Lutherans are to be concerned about will consist of? For example, what will be "**final American Lutheranism**" in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Sunday, and the church's practice of the Lord's Supper? What is the point of moving into figures of speech that anyone can interpret as they wish? Or is this very vagueness and indeterminacy itself supposed to be an essential characteristic of "definitive American Lutheranism"? 12. Of the pastor of the General Council at Springfield, O., the "Zionsbote," p. 380, says: "This one is so identified with our institutions (**Hamma Divinity School**) that the Synodal boundary is scarcely noticed here." F. B.

## II. foreign countries.

**D. F. A. Philippi's hundredth birthday** fell on October 15 of last year. He died on August 29, 1882. Shortly before his death he made the following genuine Lutheran confession: "I will go to heaven, for I have never relied on the rags of my own righteousness, but only on the merit of my highly praised Savior. I have confessed JEsum in life, and I will confess him also in death. This shall be my testament, that nothing is valid before God but the righteousness of JEsu Christ alone. Cursed be all modern frauds that undermine the church of God! I want to know nothing of synergism, nothing of kenosis of the Logos, nothing of those who say that they want to continue the teaching of our church. God's Word and the confessions of our Church, nothing below and nothing above! All this is easily said, but to hold faith in death, that is hard." How low, compared with Philippi, have just also the present believing Lutheran theologians of Germany sunk! F. B.

Father Herold writes in the "N. K. Z." **about the modernism in the Bavarian church.** p. 948: "Clouds indicating thunderstorms had already risen often enough on the horizon; they could be observed for years. It is true that in official rescripts one could read again and again the assurance that the clergy of the regional church were fortunately standing on the ground of the confession, and that neology had not yet appeared anywhere in a dangerous way; but it had long been an open secret that submitted synodal works and sermons did not provide a reliable barometer. Articles in non-Bavarian theological journals of a 'liberal' direction proclaimed that there were adherents of the views represented there in the Bavarian Landeskirche. In the 'Korrespondenzblatt für die ev.-luth. Geistlichen in Bayern' (Correspondence Bulletin for the Lutheran Clergy in Bavaria) we were periodically surprised by one and another champion of 'modernism'. Gradually representatives of the left also dared to come out more openly at meetings in Bavaria itself (Pastoral Conference in Nuremberg). In the latter city, but also in Würzburg and

In Regensburg, gifted pulpit orators began their preaching activities in the modern liberal sense; according to reports, they also got their successors here and there in the country. Statements from the circles of young candidates were reported which left no doubt that they were only unwillingly imposing restraint on themselves. The one or other defection into the service of a freer church had its reason in a broken position towards Bible and confession. It did not fail to happen that at church festivals the standpoint of modern theology was quite unveiled to the masses by the chosen preachers. To attentive observers it gradually became thunderous in the country." Fr. Herold then demonstrates in detail that the leaders of the liberals, D. Geyer and D. Ritteimeyer, are "free-minded clergymen" who, in their jointly published book of sermons: "God and the Soul," present a "distinctly modern-liberal" theology and, in their Christmas, Good Friday, Often and Pentecost sermons, simply ignore the facts of salvation (Incarnation, bodily resurrection, etc.), grace as faithfulness to God, and the Holy Spirit as the gift of God.), simply ignore grace as faithful discipleship of JEsu, treat the **fides quae creditur** as Cinderella, and let the **fides qua creditur** be all. The meeting in Nuremberg last September had also shown "that the form of neology now emerging in Bavaria is a modern gnosis which must be overcome by the Church." That the liberals in Bavaria are also aiming at the abolition of the Apostolicum is evident from the fact that even now officiating clergymen no longer introduce the **Creed in the divine** service with the words of the Agende: "Confess and speak with me thus!", but like this: "Let us hear the Christian faith in the form in which our fathers confessed it." "With this," says Herold, "the Creed is made out to be something antiquated, which has no validity nowadays." From the places in Bavaria where "free-minded clergymen" are in office, one has heard for years and years of statements in sermons and teaching which are of a very critical nature. In the disputation between the right and the left in the "Korrespondenzblatt," the well-known wide rift had also opened up. Ritteimeyer had called the bodily resurrection of Jesus irrelevant and declared that there was "no mode of inner assurance" for modern man with respect to it, for on the external authority of Scripture the Easter event could not be believed in the sense of the previous church proclamation. It was expected of D. Bezzel and the General Synod that they would do something decisive to clarify the situation. The motions of the Thalmässing Synod and the Ansbach Committee had also demanded stricter action against the liberals. Other synods, however, had spoken out against action against the liberals. Yes, at the synod of Kempten, congregational representatives had vigorously opposed a disturbance of the church by "theologian bickering." With articles for and against, everyone had tried to influence the General Synod to his own side, especially the two above-mentioned leaders of the Modern Liberals, who declared that their view of JEsu's person and work alone corresponded to the rightly understood Scriptures and expressed the lasting inner truth of the Reformation confessions. But the General Synod had not fulfilled the hopes of the Positives. From the in "Doctrine

und Wehre" already reported vague resolution of the General Synod Herold writes: "A proposal which for the sake of the peculiar situation was wise, but in our opinion not suitable to clarify the situation. From various quarters we were assured that the secular deputies in their great majority were not sufficiently informed about the actual deviations of the liberals from the creed; a public debate about this would at least have had the profit of opening the eyes of wider circles of the national church to what the present crisis is actually about. Thus, however, the rift was once more artificially papered over, and finally the whole burden of responsibility was laid on the shoulders of the Supreme Consistory and its President." According to this, in Bavaria, too, the dispute between liberals and positives is not decided according to the clear Word of God, but is dressed up by clever, ecclesiastical-political considerations. F. B.

**Miscellaneous from Germany.** The Berlin Oberkirchenrat declares: "The prerequisite of our decree on the single chalice of April 3, 1900, is that the common chalice should remain the self-evident order in the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the congregation. Only those members of the congregation who take offense at this order are to be given the opportunity to celebrate the Lord's Supper in this form by celebrating with the single cup in secondary services." Maundy Thursday evening is also to be considered as the main service. From the German Protestant Church Committee in Eisenach it was reported that a life insurance for pastors was being planned, that the building of the German church in Rome had been started, that Protestant diaspora congregations had been supported, and that the Eisenach advice on the building and style of Protestant churches was receiving general attention. 3. the Prussian Diet has raised the salaries of pastors: for Protestants to $600.00 as the minimum and $1500.00 as the maximum, and for unmarried priests from $450.00 to $1000.00 as the maximum. In all cases free housing will be provided. 4. The Positive Union is now organized through all the old provinces of Prussia, and numbers 2611 members, of whom 70 are Posen, 114 Westphalia, 120 Pomerania, 136 West Prussia, 168 Silesia, 170 East Prussia, 273 Brandenburg, 284 Berlin, 562 Rhineland, 614 Saxony. (5) Intentional disturbance of the divine service by loud, continued speaking was punished with imprisonment in Mecklenburg some months ago. The Reformed Synod in Alsace-Lorraine has decided by 18 votes to 7 in favor of "the active and passive suffrage of women. In the Lutheran Church of Geneva, § 5 of the church constitution now reads, "The church recognizes complete equality of rights to all its members without restriction as to sex or nationality." And in the Friedenskirche in Bremen, as well as in the German Protestant congregation in Paris, women participated for the first time in the election of pastors. 7. The seventeenth world conference of the **Y. M. C. A**. was held in Barmen-Elberfeld. The federation has 7823 associations with 821,000 members and $60,000,000 property, over 1000 delegates from 26 countries were present. English, German, French were the principal languages.

F. B.

**The General Synod of the Unity of the Brethren** adopted, by 49 votes to one, a declaration concerning the position of its theology, in which

in which, among other things, the following sentences are found: "We are aware of the fact that, precisely on the basis of genuine evangelical, conscientious research into Scripture, at all times and in all places, and therefore also in our circle, a diversity of views is growing which must not deter us, as long as and insofar as it is a matter of different refractions of the one light which is given to us in the revelation of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Nor can we close our minds to the realization that all efforts to present the content of faith on the basis of Holy Scripture and the inner life of the church are tainted with human imperfection and fall under the word of the great apostle: 'Our knowledge is fragmentary.' In this we take comfort in the promise of our Lord that the Spirit of truth, which he has communicated to his church, will, as the most infallible teacher, guide it into all truth. Therefore our Church of the Brethren, in spite of all the dangers which may be connected with it, leaves room in its midst for theological work, because it cannot do without its service with the whole Church, and sees the surest guarantee for a blessed service of the same in the fact that its theologically educated ministers, and especially the teachers of theology, are sincere and willing pupils of this Holy Spirit, who are ready, guided by this Spirit, to penetrate into the understanding of the Word of God with the means of human science at their command, and to communicate the same." Hereby the Church of the Brethren has thrown in the towel to liberalism and surrendered its only faculty to unbelief. The "Reichsbote" writes: "We expected an unmistakable statement against the doctrines of Unitarianism, a clear confession of the Deity of JEsu, a clear statement of the bodily resurrection of Christ, as well as of His personal pre- and postexistence, an affirmation of the Christian hope, that is, of His parousia. . . . To all these questions the fraternal General Synod gives us no answer, whether intentionally? For almost all the Synod members are theologians. But is this where the harm lies? " F. B.

**The Anglican and Swedish Churches.** The "A. E. L. K." writes: "The Anglican Church has for some years been seeking to establish closer relations with the Swedish Church. As early as 1888 the Lambeth Conference passed a resolution welcoming the possibility of closer relations with the Scandinavian Churches, and a similar resolution was passed by the Lambeth Conference of 1897, but without further practical effect. Last year (1908), however, in reply to these resolutions, Bishop Tottie of Kalmar was sent to England to welcome the Lambeth Conference on behalf of the Archbishop of Upsala. He presented a letter from the Archbishop, dated 20 June 1908, which contained the following passage: 'We are glad that the Anglican Bishops have for some time been planning the union of your Church and ours into some sort of alliance. I would ask you to discuss the further terms and form of such an alliance with Henry William Tottie, Bishop of Kalmar, my beloved brother bishop, who, with your kind permission and on behalf of our most gracious King, will attend the Council which you are about to hold.' Bishop Tottie then attended the Lambeth Conference, as the first foreign bishop that ever spoke at it, and

the Conference finally passed the following resolution: -This Conference thanks the Archbishop of Upsala for his kind letter of welcome, and for sending his honoured colleague the Bishop of Kalmar to confer with the members on the question of an alliance of some kind between the Swedish and English Churches. The Conference asks the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Commission to confer with the Swedish Church through the Archbishop of Upsala on the possibility and terms of such an alliance/ The Commission then appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury comprises four bishops, including the Bishop of London, who has Anglican jurisdiction over Northern and Central Europe, and the Bishop of Salisbury, plus other senior clergy. In September of this year (1909) she made a journey to Sweden to negotiate with the Swedish bishops in the Chapter House at Upsala. An account of this trip from the hand of the Bishop of Salisbury is found in the ***Salisbury Diocesan gazette of*** November 1909, and another by Canon Mason in the ***Guardian of*** October 20. The Archbishop of Upsala had invited all 13 Swedish bishops to this meeting; but only one appeared, while six others sent telegrams of welcome. In addition, the English deputation was received in audience by the King of Sweden and the Crown Princess. The discussions related especially to episcopal succession in both countries, the form of ordination, the relations of church and state, doctrinal symbols, liturgy, confirmation, etc., and the missions and colonies of the Swedes in English possessions. No resolutions of any kind were passed at the conference, which lasted from September 21 to 23. At the end, however, the Archbishop of Upsala announced that he intended to set up a permanent commission which should remain in permanent relation with the English commission. The Bishop of Salisbury himself is evidently very much inclined to a union, and particularly emphasizes that the 39 Articles of the Anglican Church were based on the unaltered Augsburg Confession, and that Melanchthon in Art. VII of the Apology expressly says that the old order of the Church and the ordinations described in the old Canons of the Church should be retained; on the other hand, he misses the Ordo of the Diaconate in Sweden. Somewhat more critical is that of November 12. It, too, lays no weight whatever on doctrine, since, after all, even the 39 Articles are not wholly orthodox, but the decisive question for it is the validity of the ecclesiastical office in Sweden. If the Swedish ordination is valid, then the Swedish Church belongs to the Catholic Church, and a settlement is possible. If, however, the ecclesiastical office in Sweden were invalid, it would be necessary to resort to the remedy which had been used in Scotland in the seventeenth century, that is, the Swedish bishops would have to be ordained afterwards by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The adoption of such conditions would, of course, be out of the question for the Swedish Church."

**From the Mission.** 1. Of the 1579 million inhabitants of the earth, 549 million are Christians, of whom 166½ million are Protestant, 264½ million Roman, and 109 million Greek Catholic. So even the statistics do not give an absolute majority to the Roman. At the beginning of this year there were 71,818 Protestant and 61,095 Roman Christians in Japan.

and 30,166 Greek Christians. In 1907 the evangelical Christians themselves raised 571,185 marks. On January 1, 1908, there were 5995 ordained missionaries; 2956 teachers, doctors, craftsmen; 4397 missionary sisters and 6408 married missionary women; 98,955 native helpers, including 4999 ordained preachers; 41,563 stations with 4,285,199 Christians; 28,164 schools with 1,290,582 pupils; 95,726,688 marks of income at home and 20,295,580 marks on the mission fields. The Hermannsburger Missionsblatt repeats the old complaint: the greatest obstacle to the heathen mission is not the sins and vices of the heathen, but the European drunkards, cursers, and libertines, who undermine confidence in the missionaries and preach to the natives that the missionaries seek only to enrich themselves. 5 The Leipzig Mission has 42,444 native children in school in German East Africa. The Goßner Mission complains of insufficient income and that the debt of the previous year, over 160,000 Marks, is still not covered. However, it has had great success in its mission areas. The Swedish Church Mission has 13 missionaries and 10 missionary sisters and 1481 people entitled to Holy Communion among the Zuluaffians, and in India 8 missionaries, 1 missionary doctor and 5 missionary sisters and 833 people entitled to Holy Communion. The general student mission conference, which is held every four years by the Studentenbunü für Mission (Student Mission Union), which consists of academics who are determined to enter into the service of missions, met in Halle. The Union has its backing in the Christian Student Association. Guests appeared from Holland, England, Scandinavia, etc. John Motts from New Dort also gave an address on "open doors in East Asia." 9. England has 2087 missionary sisters besides 2061 missionaries, America 1754 besides 2086 missionaries and Germany only 167 besides 922 missionaries. In 1908 in Austria 4585 converted to the Protestant Church and 1091 left it. So there is neither an end nor a decrease of this movement in sight. In Belgium the evangelical church consists of converted coal miners, glass and iron workers in 42 congregations and 78 branches with 7066 members and 3704 children, 103 Sunday schools and 4083 pupils, 77 churches, 36 preachers, 3 evangelists, 18 Bible messengers, two periodicals with a total of 2800 subscribers. 12. The population of China is 422,300,000, among whom there are 1648 male and 2301 female evangelical missionaries in only 648 stations. 13. Persia has 12,000,000 inhabitants, of whom 8000 are Catholics and 3000 Protestants. 14. According to the reports of Presbyterian missionaries, the oppression in the Congo region is now worse than before. If the imposed quantum of rubber is not brought in, the hippopotamus whip is applied, and women and children are penned up as hostages. Even from Belgium it is now written: "In the Congo State a system has gradually developed which should arouse the horror of all Christian hearts, and we know that up to now no change has occurred. Is it not then the duty of all Christians to protest together?" Protestant missionaries first pointed out the atrocities in the Congo. 15. The British and Foreign Bible Society distributed in 1908 no less than 5,934,711 copies of the Holy Scriptures in 413 languages, about a million more than the previous year. It is hoped to exceed the sixth million this year. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56.** **February 1910.** **No. 2.**

## The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53.

The article of vicarious satisfaction, in which the Christian's consolation is concentrated, is at present considered antiquated within the Protestant Church. The modern liberal theologians do not want to know anything at all about redemption through Christ, and see in Jesus only the revelator of God's fatherly love, who freely forgives men their sins, without mediator and atonement. They regard the idea of redemption as an alien growth grafted on to the original Christianity, and taken over from the Oriental "religions of redemption". And so many Protestant preachers of the present day place the old "blood theory," the **atonement, before their** hearers as a spectre of terror. But even the modern "ecclesiastical" theologians have broken with the old dogma. Though they still allow JEsum to be "Saviour" and "Redeemer," yet they **de facto** deny the atonement, putting Christ's suffering and death not as a "material achievement," but only as an "ethical achievement," the effect of which amounts to the ethical transformation of man. The atonement for sins recedes into the background, appearing only as a passage to the moral restoration of humanity. The idea of substitution has been translated, for instance, into the idea of the "generic man" or "Jdeal man". The great ethical deed of Jesus, his obedience in suffering, is according to this view a moral deed of mankind united in Jesus, the generic man, who has thus redeemed himself. And accordingly, in the last few decades, whole great pastoral conferences, and that of the "confessional" ones, in Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, have formally and solemnly renounced the **satisfactio vicaria of the** ancients. This is also the mood of so many sectarian preachers in this country who still preach Christ crucified. For our part, we do not allow ourselves to be disturbed by the contradiction on the right and on the left, we do not allow ourselves to be robbed and diminished by the treasure and comfort of the Christians. We stick to the old motto: Here comes a poor sinner who would like to be blessed by the ransom. This has good, solid ground in Scripture. Let us now take a look at the

50The **satisfactio vicaria** according to Isaiah 53.

We shall look more closely at the Old Testament **locus classicus** for this doctrine, the 53rd chapter of the prophet Isaiah, with brief contact with New Testament parallels. This is not intended to be an exegesis of Isaiah 53 proper, but we will only put our finger on those phrases and expressions which are relevant for the purpose mentioned, and consider the context only as far as our subject requires it.

The three verses 52:13-15 form, as it were, the introduction to the "golden passionale" or "Good Friday sermon" of the Old Testament evangelist. "Behold, my servant shall do wisely; he shall ascend, and be lifted up, and be very high." 52, 13. That the Servant of the LORD, of whom mention is here made, as e. g. also 42, 1 sf., is an individual, and the Messiah of Israel, is evident, acknowledged by all Christian commentators, conceded also by subtle critics, as Cheyne, Driver, and Jewish scholars, as Abravanel. Christ is called the servant of the LORD, because he is sent by the LORD to execute his counsel and will on earth, and this servant of the LORD will, as the LORD speaks, "act wisely," by directing his commission well, acting according to his calling. And so he shall ascend, XXX, and be exalted, XXXX, and be very high, XXX XXXX. The Spirit of Christ, which was in the prophets, has here τάς ***μετά ταῦτα δόξας,*** 1 Pet. 1:11, the three stages of exaltation, which we now clearly distinguish from the standpoint of fulfillment, in view: the resurrection, ascension of Christ, sitting at the right hand. The connection of thought v. 13 a and 13 b is the same as Phil. 2, 8. 9: "He was obedient unto death . . . . Therefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." The state of Christ's humiliation and exaltation is also expressed in the following sentence: "As many were astonished at thee-so disfigured, not like a man was his appearance, and his form not like the children of men-so shall he sprinkle many nations, over him shall kings shut their mouths; for what they have not been told they see, and what they have not heard they perceive." Many were astonished at first at the servant of the Lord, because he was so deformed and no longer looked like a man. He was struck by an extraordinary and terrible fate, heavy and dark sufferings surrounded him and made him completely unrecognizable. But the horror turned into joyful admiration. When he is exalted, he will sprinkle many heathen, nations, kings. This. This line of thought lies in the **parallelism membrorum**. We translate "sprinkle," and not "make leap up," in the sense of make exult, **exsilire faciet,** as most recent exegetes do. This translation has no hold on the usage of the language. The verbum XXX is **terminus technicus** in the sacrificial Torah, meaning only "to sprinkle," to sprinkle with sacrificial blood or cleansing waffle, for the purpose of desecration. This is the work of the exalted Christ, that he sprinkles, de-sanctifies, cleanses Gentiles, sinners, the unclean. It is therefore an atonement

of sins are present. The servant of the Lord procured it himself through suffering and death. And now that he is exalted, he applies this atonement to the sinners of the earth. The consequence of the atonement is that the heathen and kings shut their mouths and fall silent for joy, thanksgiving, and amazement. All the misery of sin has been turned from once, sin, impurity has been turned into righteousness, holiness. They have heard a message of which they have never heard before, a quite unheard message, the message of their salvation. By this very message, by the preaching of the gospel, they have been made sinless. The word, the preaching of the gospel, is the means by which the exalted Christ applies his atonement and redemption to the consciences of sinners, to speak New Testament: sprinkles them with his blood. 1 Pet. 1, 2. This is the **nexus rerum** here. So already in the introduction the keynote of the prophetic sermon is struck: the atonement of sins.

The news that many Gentiles will hear and receive with joy is the same news that Israel already hears from the mouth of its prophet. But when the prophet Isaiah prepares to tell his people about what the servant of the Lord has done, what he has suffered, what has happened to him, and to recount it, even to recount it as one recounts the past, he breaks out into lamentation:

XXXXXXX XXXX XX. "Who believes our preaching?" 53:1. Answer: no one, as good as no one. "And to whom is the arm of the Lord manifest?" Answer: to very few. The arm of the LORD is the crown of the LORD. There is divine power in the preaching of the suffering Messiah. But most resist with all their might the power, the arm of the LORD. Isaiah says, "ours," our preaching, and thus joins with all his fellow-professionals, with all preachers of salvation, even the New Testament ones. Thus the apostle Paul, where he speaks of the unbelief of the Jews, repeats the lamentation of the prophet, "Lord, who believeth our preaching?" Rom. 10:16. But the preachers of all ages, even of our day, are included in "our preaching." All who preach Christ crucified also experience it ever and anon, that this crucified Christ is to some a vexation, to others foolishness, to few God's wisdom and God's power. If we look over the whole long period of grace, the many centuries of the Christian era, the whole earth, all the peoples and nations of the earth, over which the work of the exalted Christ extends, then according to 52:15 there are many; but in every place, at every time, there are comparatively few who take to heart the message of their redemption and their blessedness. But the prophet is not deterred by the multitude of despisers, but continues as he began 52:14, "And he goeth up before him as rice," etc. And so all preachers of the gospel, notwithstanding all the evil experiences they have of the word of the cross, should stop and tell near and far, to all whom they have

of their voice, proclaim him in whom alone is salvation. They will never work in vain, their strength will not be spent in vain.

The first part of the prophetic sermon, v. 2. 3, sets before us the poor lowly servant and the great sufferer. "And he went up before him like a rice, and like a root womb of dry earth; he had no form or comeliness; we saw him, but there was no appearance to please us." What is future the prophet relates as history, and to us it is now real history. He first describes the beginnings of the earthly course and earthly destiny of the Servant of the Lord. He sprang up, sprouted up like a tender, inconspicuous rice. Men took little notice of it. But this tender rice was delicious and precious in the sight of the LORD. The suffix in XXXX goes to the last noun of 53:1, XXXX. This rice was a righteous plant, Jer. 23, 5, was the sprout of the Lord, Is. 4, 2, which the Lord had sunk into the earth. The Lord supervised and controlled the life of His servant, whom He sent into the world to carry out His counsel, from the first beginning. He guarded this tender rice that it might not be trodden down before it brought forth its fruit. The rice was a root womb. Already before. 11:1, Isaiah had prophesied, "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the tribe of Jesse, and a branch out of his root shall bring forth fruit." The proud, stately tree of the Davidic royal family had been cut down, leaving only a stump, a rootstock. Joseph the carpenter, and his confidant, and their kinsmen, were the little remnant of the house of David. The root-stump was in "dry ground." This is the name of the miserable condition of the people of Israel, who had fallen under the power of the world. But out of the dead rootstock a shoot sprouted, contrary to the course of nature. From the daughter of David, Mary, the promised Son of David was miraculously born. The servant of the Lord is the son of the virgin, Isaiah 7:14, and therefore a pure, undefiled human child, yes, that Immanuel, God in our flesh and blood, is the strong God Himself. 9:5. However, He was born in deep poverty and lowliness and then grew up in poor, lowly circumstances, shared in the poverty of His family, in the shame of His people. The beginning corresponded to the progress. When he grew to manhood and went out and in among his people, he showed no form or beauty. His contemporaries judged: We saw him, but there was no appearance, no sight to please us. The Messiah of Israel had nothing attractive, nothing captivating to the natural man. He was not a great, distinguished man in the sense of the world. As a poor, lowly rabbi he passed through the land had not, as he laid down his head finely, he walked wearily and labored in the service of the wretched, the weak, the sick. Even when he did his miracles

he did not cast off the form of a servant. From the mouth of this rabbi, this teacher in Israel, flowed no proud, lofty words, but simple, plain speech, calculated for the simple. He did not make a fuss with his preaching, he did not shout or cry out, nor did he make his voice heard in the streets. 42, 3. He did not earn, did not possess the favor of the people, the great multitude. But the Lord testified of him, "Behold, this is my servant, and my chosen, in whom my soul is well pleased." 42:1. Let us here further notice the following. This characteristic of the prophet presents the picture of a certain human individual with marked features. Verily, JEsus, the Son of man, was not a phantom only with human trappings, not a "generic man," not a general man, not humanity **in nuce**, but man among men, one man among many, a single member of the human race, a son of Adam, a son of Abraham, a son of David, the son of Mary, born in Bethlehem, raised in Nazareth, the prophet of Galilee, a man from the lower classes of the people, a man like other men, admittedly without sin, and a person who, according to Isa. 7 and 9 he had a unique relationship to God.

The poverty, lowliness, disregard increased to contempt, disgrace, suffering. "Despised was he, and ceasing to be a man, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with sickness, and as one from whom one veils his face, despised, and we esteemed him nothing." He was despised, looked upon with utter contempt. Why, the following expression tells. Since XXX is demonstrable only in the meaning "to cease," XXXX XXX cannot mean **destitutus virorum**, forsaken by men or nobles, but only **deficiens virorum,** one who has ceased to be numbered among men, among men, who no longer resembles any man, any man. This thought had already been expressed in 52:14, where it was said of the servant of the Lord that his appearance, his form, was deformed XXX XXXX, XXXX, away from man, away from the children of men. There was no longer anything human about him, no dignity of man, no honor of man; he had sunk below the level of man. Thus the suffering Messiah laments Ps. 22:7: "I am a worm and not a man," and therefore "the scorn of men and the contempt of the people." That which humbled Him so low among men, and made Him so despised, was precisely His severe, unique suffering. "He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with sickness." XXX is not only sickness in the ordinary sense of the word, but in general weakness, suffering, but then also specifically "wound," "sore of blow" (Delitzsch), Isa. 1:5. Jer. 10:19; 5:3; XXXX denotes both bodily and mental pain, heartache, sorrow. XXX XXXXXX, "man of sorrows," is a man to whom pain is the

XXX XXXX, **scitus morbi,** is one who is familiar with sickness, suffering, who understands it, to whom suffering is his business, his profession. Thus the servant of the Lord was full of pain and sickness, overwhelmed with it. Since the fall of Adam, suffering, pain has been the common human lot. But only a certain measure of suffering is tolerable for man. The servant of the Lord had an excess of suffering, which made him unlike man. The present brief characterization of the suffering Messiah receives its full light from the history of the fulfillment. The whole life of Jesus on earth was one of uninterrupted suffering. Even the infant JEsus was persecuted. When he walked about among his people, bestowing only blessings and benefits, the rulers of the people laid their snares everywhere in his path. He tasted the woe of human life like no other man, and then the woe of death. The story of the Passion in particular presents us with the individual features of the Man of Sorrows. We see on him bands, blows, welts, wounds; we see his head full of blood and wounds. Otherwise a poor thief who was to die on the cross was spared the scourging. JEsum met both scourge and cross. And he felt the torture too. "Out of his noble heart with inexhaustible pain one sigh after another poured." In his great pain he cried out, "I thirst!" The pains of his soul still outweighed the pains of his body. His soul was grieved unto death. To be condemned without cause or reason, that grieves bitterly. The innocent JEsus was condemned twice, by his own people and by the Gentiles. Otherwise a poor thief who is led to death is pitied. A whole flood of mockeries, vituperations, and blasphemies poured out upon JEsum. The people saw their joy in his torment. The later disciples of JEsu, the Christian martyrs, were accompanied on their way to death by the acclamations, encouragements, consolations of their brethren and friends. JEfus had no fellow-sufferer, no comforter by his side. All his own had forsaken him. The Christian martyrs were lifted and carried by the power and comfort of God in the most trying hours, often felt it quite perceptibly that another, the LORD for whom they sacrificed their lives, was suffering and struggling with them and in them. JEsus, when his passion had reached its climax, lamented, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And not only was he forsaken by the sense of comfort and nearness to God, no, he was really and truly, in the fullest sense of the word, forsaken by God. God had withdrawn from him all succor, all comfort, had withdrawn from him his gracious presence, had hidden his face from him. Verily, an inhuman, superhuman suffering! Verily, woe, pain, sickness without matzo or purpose! We understand that all those who saw this Man of Sorrows, and had just been with

They looked at him with eyes of the flesh, they respected him nothing, they despised him, they covered their faces before him. Such an image, in which one sees only evil, nothing but misery and wretchedness, has something repulsive and horrifying for the natural man. And if we now add what was hidden from the unbelieving contemporaries of the Messiah, that it was the sweet root Jesse, the immaculate Son of the Virgin, that it was Christ Immanuel, who had to suffer unspeakably more and more severely than any sinful man, the alienation becomes only the stronger and we stare with horror into this abyss of suffering. But when we then read and hear how the prophet solves this riddle: "Truly he bore our sickness," etc.-then our amazement and horror vanish, and the image of the great sufferer, this figure of sorrow, becomes the feast of our eyes, the consolation, joy, and delight of our hearts. G. St.

(To be continued.)

## Use of the expressions καλεῖν, *κλησίς, κλητός* in the New Will.

Among the effects of the Holy Spirit through the gospel, we mention calling in the first place. It does not seem difficult to say what is meant by the calling of God; and yet opinions differ widely on this. Is the calling of God nothing more than a mere inviting (**invitare**) to the goods of grace of the Gospel, without force and effect, so that it then depends on something else whether a man accepts or not? Or is the calling of God of two kinds: in some, a mere inviting, without spirit and power (**ineffectual calling**), whence it is explained that so many who also hear the gospel do not become blessed; in others, such a calling, in which at the same time the Spirit of God is also powerful for acceptance (**effectual calling**), as the calling proves to be in those who become blessed? Or is the calling of God always a powerful one, but in the sense that it gives power of acceptance to every one to whom it is given, so that therefore through the calling acceptance is also made possible to man, and he is converted, if he just uses the power given? Or is the divine calling such a calling, which not only gives the power of acceptance, but also draws (**arcessit**) the man to God, thus converting him, so that the Christian owes his conversion precisely to the powerful call of God, in which case, however, it is to be noted that the fault lies solely with men and not somehow with the word, if many, who certainly also hear the salvific gospel, are nevertheless not converted (two propositions, however, which cannot be conveyed to reason in its present state)? How does the matter stand?

An exhaustive answer to this question naturally requires an in-depth consideration of all that Scripture says about the means of grace through which the call is made and about their power and effect, as well as what it teaches about the condition of the natural man. It is the purpose of the following lines to note how the New Testament uses the expression "called." It is the verb καλεῖν**,** the noun κλήσις**,** and the verbal adjective (adjective and noun) κλητός**.**

Since the profane writers lack the notion of a calling of God by the gospel, it occurs with them only in the ordinary meaning to call, to name, to be called; to call, to summon, to invite, to summon before the court; in the meaning to call, to summon, to summon before the court, to name, to name;

***κλητός*** meaning called, summoned, invited, demanded in court, summoned. So the expressions occur to some extent in the New Testament. But as so many other words in the Bible verse have acquired a different, a specifically Christian meaning, because there are other, new terms involved, which the heathen did not know, so it is here. ***Καλεῖν, κλήσις, κλητός*** are given technical

The term "Christian" is a term that is used to describe the specifically Christian concept. - We will now first register the occurrence of the words in question in the individual writers of the New Testament, then examine the passages themselves, and finally summarize the result.

To the following table this should be noted. Only the simplex is included. Many composites of καλεῖν occur in the New Testament, but they are of no further importance for our purpose. Only in three places in the Acts of the Apostles does **προσκαλεῖσ& *αι*** occur in a specifically Christian sense; otherwise it is used in the general sense of calling, calling to heart. It is so found in Matthew, Mark, Luke (Gospel and Acts), and James, 27 times in all. ***Ἐπικαλεῖν,*** to name, give epithets to, or call,

is found in Matthew and in the Gospel of Luke once each, but very often in the Acts of the Apostles and also in the following epistles: Rom., 2 Cor., 2 Tim., 1 Petr., Heb., James, in all 32 times. ***Συγκαλεῖν,*** call together, has Mark once, Luke.

In the Gospel and Acts 3 times each. ***Εἰσκαλεῖσ& αι,***

Call in, is Apost. 10, 23; ***ἀντικαλεῖν,*** invite again, Luk.

14, 12. ***Μετακαλεῖσ-θ-αι,*** to cause to be called again, Luke uses 3 times.

***Προκαλεῖν*** (Gal. 5, 26 only) and the frequently occurring **εγκαλεῖν are** still more remote from our consideration on account of their meaning, ebenfo the much-used **παρακα*). εῖν,*** whence **παράκλησις and παράκλητος. *"Εκκαλεῖν,*** the base form of **εκκλησία,** occurs in the New Testament.

does not occur. For the sake of completeness it may be pointed out that Mark and Luke**,** but especially often John, use for call, and instead of **καλούμενος or επικαλούμενος,** "so called," comes

occurs in Luke and more frequently in John **λεγόμενος.**

## Tabular overview
via
## The occurrence of χαλεῖν, χλησις, χλψός in the New Testament.

| *καλεῖν.* Usual meaning. | Concise Christian Meaning. | *κλήσις.* Occurs only in concise Christian meaning. | *κλητός.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Matt. 1:21, 23, 24; 2:7, 9, 23; 4:21; 5:9, 19; 10:25; 20:16; 21:13; 22:23, 45; 22:1-14; 25:14; 27:8. | 9, 13. | _ . — | General: 20, 16; 22, 14. |
| Mark. 1, 20; 3, 31; 11, 17. | 2, 17.<br>5, 32. | - -<br>- - | - -<br>- - |
| Luk 1, 13. 31. 32. 35. 59.60. 61.62.76; 2, 4.21 (2 times). 23; 6, 15. 46; 7, 11. 39; 8, 2; 9, 10; 10, 39; 14, 7-24; 15, 19. 21; 19, 2. 13. 28; 21, 37; 22, 25; 23, 32. | | | |
| Joh. 1, 43; 2, 3; 10, 3. | - - | . -- | -- -- |
| Apost. 1, 12. 19. 23; 3, 11; 4, 18; 7, 58; 9,11; 10,1; 13, 1; 14,12; 15, 37; 24, 23; 27, 8. 14. 15: 28. 1. | : 2, 39; 13, 2; 16,10. | - - | - - |
| Rom. 9, 7. 26. | 4:17; 8:30(2 times); 9, 12. 23. 24. | 11, 29. | Concise: 1.1. 6. 7; 8, 28. |
| 1 Cor. 10:27; 15:9. | 1, 9; 7, 15-24 (9 times). | 1, 26; 7, 20. | 1, 1. 2. 24. |
| 2 Cor. - - | - - | - - | - - |
| Gal. - - | 1, 6. 15; 5, 8. 15. | - - | - - |
| Eph. - - | 4, 1. 4. | 1, 18; 4, 1. 4. | - - |
| Phil. - - | - - | 3, 14. | - - |
| Col. - - | 3, 15. | - - | - - |
| 1 Thess. - - | 2, 12; 4, 7; 5,24. | -- | - - |
| 2 Thess. - - | 2, 13. | 1,11. | -- -- |
| 1 Tim. - - | 5, 12. | - - | - - |
| 2 Tim. - - | 1, 9. | 1,9. | - - |
| Tit. - - | - - | --- --" | - - |
| Philem. - - | - - | -- -- | ---------- - . |
| 1 Petr. 3, 6. | 1,15; 2,9.21; 3,9; 5, 10. | - - | - - |
| 2 Petr. - - | 1, 3. | 1, 10. | - - |
| 1 Joh. 3, 1. | - - | - - | - - |
| 2 Joh. ---------- | - .- | - - | - - |
| 3 Joh. - - | --- -- | - - | - - |
| Heb. 2:11; 3:13; 11:18. | 5, 4; 9, 15; 11,8. | 3, 1. | - - |
| Jas. 2, 23. | - - | -- ------- | - - |
| Jude. - - | - -- | - - | 1. |
| Rev. 1:9; 11:8; 12:9; 16, 16; 19, 11. 13. | 19, 9. | - - | 17, 14. |
| Summa: 93 | 45 | 11 | 11 |

As the table shows, in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, moreover still in the Revelation, it occurs predominantly in the ordinary meaning. The matter is quite different in the epistles. We have wavered whether Matth. 4, 21 and Mark. 1, 20 should rather be placed in the second category. There is talk about the calling of James and John. Luther translates: "and soon he called them". In any case, the word here is also meant locally. The two were to come out of the ship to JEsu, as it is said, "Soon they left the ship and their father, and followed him." But this mere local movement from one place to another was not all that was meant by the ***έκάλεοε αυτούς*.** James and John were here called to the spiritual succession of JEsu, and at the same time to the apostleship. For our purpose only the passages where God's call to men is used come into consideration.

Matth. 9, 13; Mark. 2, 17; Luk. 5, 32: ***Ούγάρ ήλϋον*** (Lukas:

***ελήλν'&α') καλέ oat δικαίους, άλλ' αμαρτωλούς εις μετάνοιαν***. The addition είς ***μετάνοιαν*** is disputed in Matthew and Mark. "I am not come to call the righteous to repentance, but sinners." With the words ***άκολού& ει μοι*** JEsus had called the publican Matthew Levi to Himself, and the one called had left everything, got up, and followed Him. At the supper which he prepared for JEsu thereupon, many publicans and sinners had appeared and were sitting at table with JEsu and his disciples. Now when the scribes and Pharisees murmured at this, and made their displeasure known to the other disciples, JEsus said unto them, The strong have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what these things are, I am well pleased with mercy, and not with sacrifice. I am come," etc. It is to be observed, first, that we are here speaking of the objects of the call, not of acceptance or non-acceptance. It is not said that Jesus came to issue an invitation and now waits to see who will accept it and who will not. Then there was the fact that first of all a sinner was successfully called, and that JEsus sat down at the table with him and others of a similar kind. How it was with these others, on what occasion they were there, whether they had all come from right motives, is not said. In any case they were there. It may be that Jesus on this occasion called some to repentance who were not converted, but nothing is said of this. It is not within the scope of this context. JEsus now defends his action in calling the publican, and sitting at table with publicans and sinners, by the general explanation that he had just come to call not righteous, but sinners to repentance. ***Καλέοαι*** - the infinitive of the aorist denotes the term

In itself - to grasp here in the sense of invite, is obviously too weak according to the context. There is more in the word. It will be synonymous with bring. This view becomes still more compelling, if in the places mentioned the objective **εις *μετάνοιαν*** is really to be deleted, and it is thus par excellence καλέοαι.

I came not to call the righteous but sinners, that is, to call them to me, to help them as a physician, to bring them here to be my people. (Cf. Isa. 41:9; 42:6; 48:12, 13 and other Old Testament passages.) Jesus states that His mission is precisely to save sinners. If men were righteous, he would not have had to come. The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost. It is not, to be sure, entered into whether JEsus accomplishes his purpose with all, but that is evident here, his purpose is not merely to invite sinners, to call them to repentance, nor to help them only in one way or another to be converted, but his purpose is to bring them to himself by his call. ***Καλεϊν*** stands here, therefore, for the designation of the work of salvation in general, which JEsus wishes to accomplish for sinners.

Matth. 20, 1 ff. Here we have the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, which concludes with the words: **πολίοῖ *γάρ εἰοι κλητοί, ολίγοι δε εκλεκτο***ί. Mark. 10, 28 ff. stands the occasion of the parable with the doctrine, "But many shall be last which are the. Many, however, will be the first, and the first the last"; but the parable with the concluding clause, πολλοί ***κτλ***, is missing. Luk 13:30, the parallel sentence is found, "And, behold, there are last, which shall be first; and are first, which shall be last." The phrase: **πολλοί *γάρ είοι κλητοί, ολίγοι δε εκλεκτοί*** occurs again, Matt. 22, in the parable of the royal wedding.

In the present passage JEsus was prompted to say by Peter's question, "Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have in return?" JEsus first assures them it shall certainly not go unrewarded. But he at the same time adds to this promise of his a serious warning: "But many that are first," etc. What he intends by this warning he then explains by the parable: ***όμοία γάρ εοτιν κτλ***. Bengel says concerning the last words of the 19th chapter, "**Primi et ultimi vel differunt genere, ut illi sint, qui salvantur; hi, qui pereunt; vel potius gradu, ut hi quoque salventur, sed multo illis sint inferiores.**" According to the latter Were the sense this: many who once stood on high in the kingdom of God as specially honored, will have to step back again into the last ranks, into the ranks of those who do not particularly shine, and vice versa. The exhortation would then not be both to steadfastness in the faith, but rather to humility in the Christian walk. The apostles and all those who do or suffer something special for Christ should receive special honor.

and glory, but they should not insist on it, they should not get the idea that they are entitled to it by right, otherwise they would lose their honor again. The parable would then show why this happens. God's kingdom is a kingdom of grace; there it is not according to merit, even in the special glory which some shall have before others in blessedness. The εκλεκτοί Bengel then grasps in the sense of **exquisiti prae aliis**. He adds, "**Videtur hoc loco, ubi primum occurrit non omnes salvandos denotare, sed horum excellentissimos**." Against this whole view, according to which κλητοί would here be speaking of a successful vocation, there are many things, but especially the circumstance that otherwise in Scripture the **εκλεκτοί are** always associated with the blessed.
cover.

According to the other, common understanding, the words: "But many shall be last," etc. are meant in this way: Many who were once not children of God are still converted, and many who once belonged to the children of God fall away again and are finally lost. Here the picture on which the expression is based is taken from the race-course. The thought process of the connection is then this: Certainly, God will not leave unrewarded what one does or suffers for Him; but beware of the desire for reward, otherwise it may happen that you lose everything, not only your special glory, but the blessedness in general. The parable then goes on to explain how it happens that many a man, who was once in the kingdom of God, is lost after all, because he did not consider that everything depends on the grace of God the Lord. The concluding clause must then be generalized = for there are many called at all, but few are chosen. The contrast πολλοί - ***ολίγοι*** is difficult to understand if this generalization is not accepted," for the murmurers who are rejected by the master of the vineyard are not "many," and the others are not the "few"; one would have to say, then, that those who were chosen in the first hour were by far more numerous than all the others together.

Now what matters to us here is this: In the former view, the κλητοί coincide with the labourers in the vineyard, so that they would be called those who are successfully called, though some of them fall away again. In the latter view the κλητοί are all those to whom the divine call reaches at all, both those in whom it achieves its purpose, and those who believed at first, but then fall away again, as well as those who do not follow at all.

Matth. 22, 1 ff. The parable of the royal marriage here reported, which also concludes with the word: **πολλοί *γάρ είαι κλητοί, ολίγοι $ε εκλεκτοί,*** has a different scopus from that just treated of. Here we are speaking of **κεκλημένοι *είς τους γόμους*.** So these were people,

who had already received an invitation to the wedding. To these the king now sends his servants to call them to the wedding, καλεσαι, thus to tell them that now everything is ready, they should come now. It is then described how the guests did not want to come, how they despised the repeated invitation, how some of them attacked the servants, jeered and even killed them. Then the king is angry, sends out his armies, kills these murderers and sets fire to their city. To his servants he says: "The wedding is ready, but the guests - οί ***κεκλημένοι*** - were not worthy. Therefore go to the
Streets, and invite - καλέσατε - to the wedding whom ye find." Now after the tables have thus all been filled, and the king has even to turn out one of those who have come, because he has no wedding garment on, it is said in conclusion, "For many are called, but few are chosen." The **tertium comparationis** here is evidently this: As at that wedding the king so urgently sent out invitations, but many refused the invitation, and one even, though he had outwardly accepted the invitation, had yet to be cast out as a despiser, so it is in the kingdom of God. The call of God goes out to many, but only a few are "chosen; those who are saved are a small number in comparison with those to whom the call comes.

Luk 14, 15 ff. The parable of the royal wedding is similar in the main to that of the great supper, but it has some special features. Here it is emphasized that the man who made the great supper "invited many to it," ***ίκάλεοε πολλούς***. Next, as to our present purpose, it is to be observed how on the part of the host every effort is made to win guests for his great supper. After all, he says to the servant, "Go out into the highways and to the fences, and compel them to come in," ***ανάγκασαν εἰσελϋεῖν***. With the conclusion
word: "But I say unto you, that none of the men which are bidden ονδείς ***των άνδρων εκείνων των κεκλημένων shall*** taste my supper.
The lesson that is to be drawn from this parable is then emphatically emphasized. There was one who was so moved by JEsu's speech at a banquet that he exclaimed, "Blessed is he that eateth bread in the kingdom of God!" To this JEsus says with the parable: Yes, blessed is he; but what experiences must the good Lord have! He has prepared for men great goods of grace, and calls them to Him with great urgency; but many, with irresponsible contempt, throw everything to the winds. Such will learn with horror what they have defrauded themselves of. Therefore be warned against despising the divine call of grace. The parable, then, is about the contempt of God's call and the terrible consequences that follow.

Apost. 2, 39. To those who on the day of Pentecost had heard Peter's sermon and asked: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" the apostle says: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For yours and your children's is this promise **καί *πασι τοϊς εις μακράν, όσους άν προσκαλέσηται κύριος ό & εός ήμων."*** The relative clause with ai, and the subjunctive of the aorist, is a hypothetical, and a general one, to be translated with the German future tense, as Luther also renders the words, "and of all that are afar off, whom"-however many-"God our HErr will call to heart." ***Προσκαλεϊσόαι,*** so often used by the Synoptics in the ordinary sense of calling forth, has here evidently the concise meaning = called by the Gospel. And it is not here speaking of the Divine calling in and of itself without regard to effect or success. This alone leads us to think here not of a mere invitation, nor merely of a possible greater or lesser assistance, but of a bringing. The promise belongs to all those whom God will bring by his call. Note further the medium. Taken in the dative-reflexive sense, it means: to call to oneself, for oneself. But it can also be taken dynamically = to call out of oneself, out of God's power, i.e. = to call emphatically. Finally, consider the context. It is spoken to those on whom the word already showed its power. To them the apostle applies the promise of the gospel. Then he lets his gaze wander further and says that this promise belongs not only to you, but also to all those who are now still far away, but whom God will also bring. Cf. Joel 3:5: "For in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be salvation, as the LORD hath promised, even to the remnant whom the LORD shall call." Weimar Bible: "Whom God our Lord will call (that they may become citizens with the saints and members of God's household, Eph. 2, 19, also his people and property, 1 Petr. 2, 10; Hos. 2, 23, and obtain the blessing with the seed of Abraham, Gen. 22, 18, although this grace, especially the sending of the Holy Spirit, will not happen to them with such miracles as it does to you now; see Isa. 44, 3 ff.; Eph. 1, 14) ."

Apost. 13, 2: "And when they were ministering unto the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said, Set me apart Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them", **προσκέκλημαι.** - Apost. 16, 10: "But when he had seen the vision, we immediately sought to travel in Macedonia, certain that the Lord had called us thither, προσκέκληται to preach the gospel to them." In both these passages there is mention of being called to a special missionary work. Each time the perfect tense is used, which denotes the accomplished act-.

thing, the condition. The Christians in Antioch are not to make Barnabas and Paul Gentile apostles first - God did that. Those made Gentile apostles by God are to be set apart, set apart, dismissed, and sent out by the church at Antioch. And by the appearance of the man of Macedonia, Paul and his companions became certain that God had not merely invited them thither to himself, but had drawn them to himself with power. Bengel: *"**Προσκέκληται,*** **arcessierit. Itaque Dominus jam ibi erat, et praeviam ejus apud Macedonas praesentiam adumbrabat visio**." We are here clearly dealing with a successful appeal.

We may well pause here for a moment to briefly summarize the result of our reflections for the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

Matth. 22 and at least 20 speaks of the call of God, namely as one that goes out to many, but is despised by many. It is similar in Luk 14. Here, as also in Matth 22, it is especially emphasized that this call is a serious and urgent one, a call where God does not miss anything to win people, so that it is only man's fault when he gets lost. In the passages Matth. 9, 13; Mark. 2, 17; Luk. 5, 32 is completely apart from those where God's call will be unsuccessful. The purpose of the coming of Jesus is to call sinners to repentance, that is, to save and make them blessed through the call of the gospel. Apost. 2, 39 speaks of God calling even many who are far off, that is, making them partakers of the divine promises through His call of grace. Apost. 13, 2 and 16, 10 the thought is this, that God by his call has made people missionaries or destined them for a special field of work. So God's call here is a successful one, which really does what He calls to do. There is no evidence for the assumption that the divine call gives all those who receive it the strength to accept it and that it depends on who uses such strength and who does not.

It is in the nature of the Gospels and Acts as historical books that καλεῖν and its composites occur so frequently in the ordinary sense, and it will easily be seen that in the Epistles as doctrinal writings there could be little occasion for this use. But for this in the latter the specifically Christian concise use stands out the more clearly.

Rom. 1, 1: ***Παῦλος, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χρίστον, κλητός απόστολος, άφω- ρισμένος είς εναγγέλιον ὕεοϋ,*** "Paul, a servant of JEsu Christ, one
called apostle, set apart unto the gospel of God." The verbal adjective is here in an official sense: called apostle = be-

call to the apostle. It is obvious that we are talking about a successful call. "Called apostle" cannot mean merely invited to the apostleship, nor can it mean merely called, whereby the possibility of non-acceptance would still be open. "Called apostle" means that Paul became an apostle through the call of Christ, which is also confirmed by the other expressions. Bengel: "**Paul . per vocationem apostolus factus est.**" And referring to the passage 4:17, to be treated later, he adds, "**Dum vocat Christus, facit quod vocat.**"

Similarly to the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul introduces himself in the First Epistle to the Corinthians: ***Παύλος, κλητός απόστολος*** [3] ***Ιησού Χρίστον διά θελήματος Φεον***, "Paul, called apostle of JEsu Christ by the will of God."

Rom. 1, 6. 7: **εν *οίς έστε και υμείς κλητοί*** [3] ***Ιησοϋ Χρίστου, πασι τοΐς ουσιν εν 'Ρώμη άγαπητοΐς ϋ-εον, κλητοΐς άγίοις,*** "among whom also ye are called JEsu Christi: To all those who are in Rome, beloved of God, called saints." These words are from the address of the Epistle. The Epistle to the Romans is addressed to the Romans as called JEsu Christ, beloved of God, called saints. cannot here mean invited JEsu Christ, or invited and graced with power to accept JEsu Christ. It must be, by the profession of JEsu, members, converts. Only look at the other expression, κλητοί ***άγιοι.*** Surely one cannot translate: invited saints. Then the persons concerned would be saints beforehand; κλητοί ***άγιοι*** can only mean: made saints by profession. All the expressions here used, as well as some others in Scripture, are designations for the believing children of God, or, as we now briefly say, for Christians. St. Paul writes to the Christians at Rome, as is especially evident from verses 8 ff. when it is said, e. g., "In the first place I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all your sakes, that your faith is spoken of in all the world." ***Κλητός*** is thus used here of the successful up.

Let us take the parallel passages: 1 Cor. 1, 2 and Jude 1. The first Epistle to the Corinthians begins, "Paul, called to be an apostle of JEsu Christ by the will of God, and brother Sosthenes: to the church of God at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ JEsu, to them that are called saints - ***κλητοϊς άγίοις*** - together with all them that call upon the name of our HCrrn JEsu Christ in all their places and ours: Grace," etc. And in the epistle of St. Jude the dedication is, "Jude, a. Servant of JEsu Christ, but a brother of Jacobi, the called, who are sanctified in God the Father and kept in JEsu Christo" - τοΐς ***εν ίλεω πατρί ήγιασμένοις καί 'Ιησοϋ Χριστψ τετηρημένοις κλητοΐς***. In both passages mention is made only of those on whom the divine call has achieved its intended effect. The called are the converted. ...m...

(Conclusion follows.)

# What we teach of the election of grace. 1)

I.

The doctrine of election to eternal life, which is not the same as that revealed in Ezek. 33, 11; 2 Petr. 3, 9; 1 Tim. 2, 4 and other passages, is clearly written in many places and is therefore a matter of faith for all Christians.

See Matt. 22:14; 24:22, 24; Rom. 8:28 ff; ch. 9-11 passim; Eph. 1:3 ff; Col. 3:12; 2 Thess. 2:13, 14; 2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pet. 1:1 ff; 2:9, and other passages, especially in Moses, the Psalms, and Isaiah.

II.

The choice is that God, in a purpose made out of eternal mercy and on the basis of the foreknowledge of Christ's merit!) made a purpose 2) before the foundation of the world 3) to provide beforehand for us, whom he has blessed in time with all kinds of spiritual blessings in heavenly goods through Christ, 4) to choose 6) and ordain for himself 7) obedience, sprinkling of the blood of Christ, 8) childship toward himself, 9) in sanctification of the Spirit and faith of the truth, 10) to blessedness. 11)

Included in this, **eo ipso,** is to call us by the gospel,12) to justify us by faith,13) to seal us with the Holy Spirit, 14) to sanctify us in the faith,15) to preserve us to the end,16) and to bring us to eternal life and glory.17)

In such his purpose, providence, election, and ordinance, God has made us so firmly his own that we are sure to be saved, cannot be finally deceived, and nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ. 18)

1) Apost. 2, 23; Eph. 1, 4; 1 Petr. 1, 20. 2) Rom. 8, 28; Eph. 1, 9. 11. 3) Eph. 1, 4; 1 Tim. 2, 9; 2 Thess. 2, 13. 4) Eph. 1, 3. 5) Rom. 8, 29 f.; 9, 25; 11, 2; 1 Petr. 1, 2. 6) Eph. 1, 4; 2 Thess. 2, 13. 7) Rom. 8, 29 f.; Eph. 1, 5. 11; Apost. 13, 48. 8) 1 Petr. 1, 2. 9) Eph. 1, 5. 10) 2 Thess. 2, 13. 11) 2 Thess. 2, 13; Apost. 13, 48. 12) Rom. 8, 28; 9, 24; Eph. 1, 9; 2 Thess. 2, 14; 2 Tim. 1, 9. 13) Rom. 8; 30-34; Eph. 1, 7. 14) Eph. 1, 13. 15) Eph. 1, 4; 1 Pet. 1, 2; 2 Thess. 2, 13. 16) Matth. 24, 22. 24; 1 Pet. 1, 5. 17) Rom. 8, 29. 30. 18) Matth. 24, 22. 24; Rom. 8, 33-39.

III.

This eternal purpose, providence, election, and ordinance God also faithfully executes in us in time, having made known to us the mystery of his will, 1) having called us with a holy calling, and 2) having given us the gift of his will.

1) We would also like to bring to the attention of the readers of our magazine the above brief and clear exposition of the doctrine of election by grace, which is true to Scripture and the Confession, and which is published in the "Theological Quarterly" of the Wisconsin Synod, Vol. 1910, No. 1.

(2) born again to a living hope, (3) justified and made acceptable by faith, (4) sealed with the Holy Spirit, (5) and by sanctifying us through the Holy Spirit, (6) and by his power keeps us in the faith unto salvation. 7)

1) Eph. 1, 9; 2 Tim. 1, 10. 2) Rom. 8, 28. 30; 9, 23 ff.; 2 Tim. 1, 9. 3) 1 Petr. 1, 3; Eph. 2, 5. 10. 4) Rom. 8, 30. 33. 34; Eph. 1, 6. 7. 5) Eph. 1, 13 f.; 4, 30; 2 Cor. 1, 22. 6) Eph. 1, 4. 8. 12. 7) 1 Petr. 1, 5; Rom. 8, 28. 38 ff.; Joh. 10, 28.

IV.

All this (namely, the eternal purpose, election, and ordinance of God for our blessedness, and his faithful execution of all this in us) is not the cause of any good thing, in or in us, either a supposed foreknowledge of non-resistance in us, or our foreknowledge of faith or perseverance in faith, but the reverse: The eternal election of God, as described above, and the execution of it in time, is, by pure grace in Christ, the cause of all spiritual good in us: of all non-resistance, of all faith and perseverance in faith, - which alone also powerfully creates, works, promotes, and accomplishes all our salvation - all that belongs to it -- as it is written Hos. 13, 9: "Israel, thou bringest thyself to trouble: for thy salvation standeth with me alone."

V.

As the eternal election of God itself is only about us Christians, and indeed about all, so also the doctrine of election speaks only of us Christians, and concerns only the pious children of God, who, standing in faith and sanctification, create their blessedness with fear and trembling, but also all. It is given to us:

1. To the consolation of all temptations, -- that we may know from the holy gospel, which is given to us in the outward word, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and is no lie (2 Cor. 1:20), that we have not come to the gospel by chance, but according to the eternal purpose, election, election, and ordinance of God, as the means by which God wills and wills to perform our eternal election in us, on which our blessedness is so firmly founded that nothing can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus;

2. to humility, - that we may more and more thoroughly recognize that without all our worthiness, merit or contribution, indeed in spite of all our unworthiness, guilt and reluctance, we have come to the gospel, to Christ, to childship and to the inheritance of eternal life by the pure grace of God the merciful, and have been preserved therein until now, - and that we may learn to praise the grace of God more and more fervently;

3. To holy zeal, that we may the more diligently work out our salvation with fear and trembling, seeking those things which are above, observing the gospel for our edification, sanctification, and

To pursue the fear of God, to put off the old man and put on the new, to seek eternal life with patience in good works, and thus to make our calling and election sure to ourselves.

VI.

This doctrine of election is, for the simple faith, in divine harmony with the doctrine of the earnestness of the general will of grace, with the converting and saving power of the Word and the sacraments, and with the doctrine of temporal believers, with the just rejection of unbelievers, since it is clearly revealed with these in the Holy Scriptures by the one God, who is not at variance with Himself. Our present reason, however, is not able to recognize this harmony, since it has not been revealed to it. Therefore the doctrine of election must not be made the object of speculation by reason, whether it be that one seeks to inquire, outside the Gospel, into the secret counsel and will of God, which is inscrutable, concerning his own or other men's election or non-election, or that one seeks to harmonize this doctrine with the doctrine of temporal believers, of the general will of grace, and of the rejection of the ungodly, in accordance with reason, - which cannot be accomplished without raping the Scriptures in one or the other of these doctrines.

John Schaller.
Wauwatosa, October 1909. Joh. Ph. Koehler.
Aug. Pieper.

Annotation. The above exposition of the doctrine of election by grace is given at the special request of the President of our Synod. In agreement with him, we hand it over to the public, so that it can be used where there is a need for it.

## Miscellany.

**A witness to the immorality of the priests and monks** at the time of the Reformation is Anna Bijns († 1575), the Dutch pamphleteer who fanatically fought the Lutherans in countless verses and incited their persecution. The "A. E. L. K." writes p. 466: "Anna Bijns was not blind to the harms of her church. She spared her own co-religionists as little as she spared the heretics. One could draw from her poems a very realistic picture of the decay of the Catholic Church at that time. But if she laid her hand on the damage and exposed it, she did not do it to sneer at it in caustic satire of a Thomas Murner. Her heart, devoted in passionate love to the Church, bled over the depravity of the clergy, especially of the monks, and in flaming

With her words she tried to call the dutyless to duty. Nothing was further from her mind than to give the weapons into the hands of the hated opponent through her outbursts. But she wanted to punish and admonish those who undermined respect for the Church by their lack of discipline. Look!' she exclaimed, 'Look! The Church is full of confusion. All went better when the abbeys were cloisters, And when the abbots dwelt like mice In holes and caves. Now they make great state with high houses. You see how it goes: they drink, they splurge, They ride on horses, they free, they card. There the shepherds loiter, Stealing wolves the sheep they hunger after.' Yet she always sought to excuse the objectionable lifestyles of priests and monks. Thus the refrain of one poem goes: 'Priests are people too, like other people.' And another poem has the refrain: 'Let he who is without sin cast the first stone.'" But of the Protestant martyrs she must confess: "They go joyfully into the fire, these false spiders. And go to death as if it were to play. " F. B.

**The principles of modern historical research** are, according to D. 1. modern historical research is aware that everything that is to be recognized as having happened cannot occur in isolation within the framework of the whole. There are no singularities and separations in history, but everything is to be evaluated according to the law of 'what has already been'. What goes beyond this can no longer be certified as historical truth. What falls outside the framework of analogy is to be rejected as unhistorical. 2. All events in history stand in an unbreakable connection of inner-worldly causation and interaction. Supernatural causes cannot be determined. Only immanent causality decides what has happened. Historical criticism does not admit absolute certainty for any single event, but only, in the best case, the highest probability. It therefore places all historical facts in the uncertain." Applying these principles to the historical foundations of Christianity, we find: "The person of Christ can only be measured by purely human standards, and there Jesus is to be regarded only as a person standing on the highest standpoint of humanity, but not as the God-man. His figure must not fall out of the analogy of great historical heroes. Revelation and miracles must be declared unhistorical. Since everything that happens must have an inner-worldly cause, there can be no supernatural revelation. Since, finally, criticism renders all facts uncertain, so also the biblical history, the facts of salvation, at bottom not even the existence of Jesus of Nazareth, can be regarded as historically certain." On this D. Hunzinger: "What shall we now say to this? We do not think at all of testing the correctness of those three basic-.

to want to deny the principles of historical research. It is quite true that the historian, historical criticism, can regard every event that has been handed down as possibly unhistorical, that it can never quite overcome the doubt about it; quite true that the historian can establish as real only that which is analogical, and must on the other hand regard with suspicion that which is analogical in history. It is quite true that the historian must demand proof of natural causes if he is to establish an event as real. Indeed, without these rules, no historical certification is possible. But the main question for us now is whether these three principles of historical criticism are to designate only the limit of what the historian can establish as real by his method, or else the limit of what may and can have happened at all. In the first case the historian is quite in the right; in the second, his method becomes an intolerable dogma, a papal prescription of what may and may not have happened. Only if these rules express the limit of scientific-historical ascertainability, but not if they express the limit of historical event possibility, do they have a claim to validity. From this it follows that historical criticism, when it confronts a figure like Jesus Christ, a figure that falls out of the analogy of humanity, out of the inner-worldly process of causation, does not have the right to say: it cannot rise above analogy and correlation. But here, too, history must remember the limits of its method. The supernatural cannot be ascertained by it historically-this is undeniable-but neither can it be denied by it without further ado. There are precisely places in history where the historian must leave open questions which he cannot decide by purely historical means. Where then the analogical, the spontaneous, the supernatural breaks forth, he has not to 'scamotize' it away by his method, but there he has to resign himself. For the limits of human cognition, of historical ascertainability, are by no means also the limits of what can and does happen at all. The historian, too, must reckon with the possibility that there can be another mode of experience and another field of experience than the scientific and also the historical, a mode of experience that can assure events and realities that always remain uncertain before the tribunal of history. Religious certainty and historical determination are therefore not in themselves contradictory, as long as they respect their different character. Just as the laws of nature known to the investigator are no barrier to natural events, so the methodological rules of the historian are no insurmountable limit to historical events. If faith achieves a **plus ultra in** both respects, then it certainly does not do so in opposition to science, but from a position to which no knowledge can be attached.

sity." As D. Dennert gives too much away when he admits that nothing can be learned about the existence of God from nature, so also D. Hunzinger, too, when he admits that nothing can be ascertained about the facts of Christianity by purely historical means. The resurrection of Christ, for example, is as historically certain as any other fact of antiquity. F. B.

**Sense of Reality and Personality.** In the "A. G." Fr. Otto writes: "Again and again we are assured with printer's ink and sound of speech that the characteristic of our time is the sense of reality and individualism. Is this really so? Whether there is not even a contradiction in this juxtaposition, since perhaps the one will, indeed must, be hostile to the other? Sense of reality? Certainly, empiricism, confidence in what is actually given, is now making itself great and wide-spread. But in the very fact that many things are regarded as actually given, which are, after all, only assumed, this empiricism slaps itself in the face; and it is no wonder that one begins to distrust the erring natural science (so, e. g., Häckel) and to miss the sense of reality in it. One recognizes as appearance what was considered to be reality. Or is the sense of reality supposed to be, above all, that one adheres only to the coarse-material and pushes away the noble-ideal underneath? This may indeed be true of our money- and pleasure-loving times. But that is just not a true sense of reality. Thus only appearance is exchanged for reality; for all these crude material things are fleeting and deceptive, and can never really satisfy. And now the other thing: individualism. If selfishness, the self-interest of the individual, has ever been the curse of mankind, it is especially evident in our day, when every one, without consideration or authority, without sympathy or love, prefers to place himself only on himself, on what he calls his profit, his advantage, and at the most joins forces with others when they hunt with him for common plunder. Where is being then, when only individual benefit, and therefore just appearance, is hunted for? Where is the objectivity of the sense of reality, when the subjectivity of the individual strives, as far as possible, to break off the general, the objectively given?"

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. "Take my hands then!" A little book of exhortation and consolation for Lutheran confirmands. (20 Cts.; purchased in lots, cheaper.) The author of this little book, as warmly and sweetly alluring as it is earnestly and forcefully admonishing and warning, is F. W. Herzberger, whose name, however, is not mentioned on the title-page. To all parents and confirmands we would like to express here-

have strongly recommended the repeated reading of it. It offers just such teachings and warnings as are needed in our time and country. The booklet is 3-3/4 X 5¼ inches, contains 83 pages, is adorned with ten puffy pictures and a dedicatory leaf, and is bound in cloth with an image of Jesus on the cover. - The same book will also be published in English by February 20, under the title, "Be Thou My Guide!" Price and furnishings as for the German edition. - 2nd "Synodal Report of the Canada District," with an excellent paper on the current subject: "The State, the Bible, and the Papacy." - 3rd "Synodical Report of the Iowa- District," with instructive proceedings on "The Time, Life, and Efficacy of the Prophet Elisha." Both reports deserve to be studied by pastors, teachers, and laymen. F. B.

**Joyful mirror of eternal life.** By Philipp Nicolai. Newly edited by Rudolf Eckhart. Published by the Lutheran Book Society, Elberfeld. Price: M. 3.50.

Of the genesis of this "Joyful Mirror," published in 1599, in which Nicolai lays bare to us his heart overflowing with the pleasure and joy of blessed Christian hope, Nicolai himself writes: "In 1597 the plague with its storm and rage attacked the city (Unna) like an unforeseen downpour and thunderstorm, soon left no house undamaged, finally also broke into my home, and the people mostly went along with a despondent mind and a frightened heart as if frozen and half dead, so that one might have applied here what Moses 5:28 writes: The LORD will give you a trembling heart, and faint eyes, and a withered soul; and your life will be suspended before you. Night and day thou shalt fear, and shalt not be sure of thy life. In the morning thou shalt say, Oh that I might live to see the evening! In the evening thou shalt say, Alas, that I might see the morning! for fear of thine heart, which shall terrify thee, and of that which thou shalt see with thine eyes.' In Lübeck, Hamburg, Lüneburg, Hildesheim, Göttingen, likewise in Lower Hesse and in the county of Waldeck, my dear fatherland: in Corbach, Wildungen and Mengeringhausen there was also no lack. And what one had now and then of friends and acquaintances in such places, of that he heard almost nothing but of their illnesses and fatal parting from this life. How then vain sad news and sad tidings came to my ears of some of my sisters, blood friends and brothers-in-law, strangled and carried away by the plague - which increased my sorrow and gave me all the more reason to turn away all my thoughts, heart and mind from the world. There was nothing sweeter, nothing dearer and nothing more pleasant to me than the contemplation of the noble, high article of eternal life, acquired through Christ's blood. I let this article run day and night in my heart and searched the Scriptures to see what they had to say about it. I also read the sweet writings of the old teacher St. Augustine, in which he bites out this high mystery as a little nut and extracts the miraculously sweet kernel. Afterwards I put my thoughts from day to day into the pen, found myself, praise God, very well, confident in my heart, cheerful in spirit and well satisfied, gave my writing the name and title of a mirror of joy and resolved to use the same mirror of joy I had written, if God would demand me from this world, as a testimony of my peaceful, cheerful and Christian farewell, or else, if he would let me remain healthy and still save to serve other needy Christians, whom he would also send the plague into the house, out of Christian guilty love, and as it were attend them with present comfort." Such are the travails out of which Nicolai's glorious book of consolation was born. The editor aptly remarks: "Wherever a soul has a heartfelt longing for blessed eternity, wherever the departure of our loved ones makes us anxious for consolation, let this writing be an unerring guide and a refreshing cup of consolation, which strengthens weary souls and makes weary feet brave again for the journey to the eternal home." We have noticed as dogmatically inaccurate the account on p. 217, where Nicolai separates the calling, the illumination, which pushes the innate darkness out of the heart and lights a new heavenly light, the contrition through the law, and justification. F. B.

**Paul Fleming's Religious Poems**. Introduced and edited by Rudolf Eckart. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau i. S. Price: M. 1.20; hardback: M. 1.50.

This booklet of 88 pages, adorned with the picture of Paul Fleming, who died on April 2, 1640, in blooming manhood, offers from the first 11 pages a biography of Fleming and a short characteristic of his spiritual poems, then two poems to Fleming, one by A. W. Schlegel and one by Gustav Schwab. Then follows from three pages an index of the various editions of his poems and on the following 62 pages the poems themselves. Also in our hymnal is found the most popular of his songs, "In allen meinen Taten lass' ich den Höchsten raten." A literary historian judges of Fleming: "From his songs the poet's noble disposition, the purity of fine character, and the deep, intimate mind of the same come out to us." October 5, 1909, was Fleming's three-hundredth birthday. May this edition of his poems help to keep his memory alive!

F. B.

**The Controversy between Erasmus and Luther on the Freedom of the Will.** Presented and judged by **Lic.** Karl Zickendraht. J. C. Hinrichssche Buchhandlung, Leipzig. Price: M. 4.50; hardback: M. 5.50.

This writing contains on XII and 205 pages: "1. the list of sources and literature about the dispute between Erasmus and Luther. 2. the prehistory of this dispute. 3. the contents of Erasmus' Diatribe. 4. the contents of Luther's De servo arbitrio. 5. the outcome of the dispute, or the contents of Erasmus' Hyperaspistes I and II. 6. notes and additions. 7. index of names." - Perception, understanding, and judgment of a writing such as Luther's De servo arbitrio depends in large part on the theological position taken by the reader. Luther states: 'Aliud est judicium ejus, qui arbitrio hominis nonnihil tribuit, aliud ejus, qui praeter gratiam nihil novit.'" This also suffers application to theologians who subject Luther's writing to judgment. Those who are themselves synergists will misrepresent Luther, misjudge him, and draw false inferences from his propositions. To see the light, the eye itself must be light and sunny. Kattenbusch, for example, is a synergist, and compares grace "to a public institution, the use of which is no merit, but the disuse of which is a debt." The consequence is that he, with Ritschl, calls Luther's mighty writing De servo arbitrio an "unhappy piece of work." The Formula of Concord, on the other hand, which advocates the monergism of grace in Scripture, judges: Luther had "Well and thoroughly executed and preserved, egregie et solide explicuit" the doctrine of Scripture on free will against Erasmus. Now Zickendraht does not want to go as far as Kattenbusch, but neither does he want to go as far as the Formula of Concord. Neither Erasmus nor Luther does he want to give the victory. As a historian, he only wants to emphasize the strong and the weak sides of each by comparing the two positions. And so he hands the palm to Luther here and to Erasmus there. The answer to the main question, however, which party has the right of truth for itself, he hopes for from the future, from "modern science". But Zickendraht will not be able to hold on to this undecided, wavering position in the long run, even apart from the possible results of modern science, for he too holds the proposition "that freedom is the prerequisite of grace". If Zickendraht sticks to this, he must decide in favor of Erasmus Wider Luther. We are not surprised, therefore, that Zickendraht has often failed to present the meaning and opinion of Luther in his De servo arbitrio correctly, e.g., in what Luther says about necessity, about the condemnation of the innocent, etc., and that he has not duly appreciated brilliant passages of Luther's book, e.g., the remarks on command and if clauses. Nor can one agree with Zickendraht when he writes, p. 65: "One can say with some reservation that the starting point of scholasticism was dogma, which demanded faith, but Luther, proceeding from faith, demanded dogma; that scholasticism demanded faith, but Luther

constructed out of him." As to Luther, as is everywhere evident from his writing, he did not develop the doctrine of free will from his faith, but simply set forth and wished to set forth what the Holy Scriptures teach concerning free will, the Scriptures which to him are the word of the Holy Spirit, and in which, according to Luther, the "majesty of the Holy Spirit" confronts us. (Luther's Works, St. Louis ed. 18, 1857. 1861.) Valuable in Zickendraht are the historical portions in the chapters, "The Prehistory of the Controversy," and "The Intermediate Period."

F. B.

**The German Element in the United States with** Special Reference to its Political, Ethical, Social, and Educational Influence. Prize-winning writing by Georg von Bosse. Published by Chr. Belser, Stuttgart.

This book, a volume of XIII and 480 pages, decorated with 25 pictures, will be read with pleasure and satisfaction by every German and especially by every German in America. The main sections are as follows: "1. The ancient Germanic tribes and their first contact with America. 2. reasons for the German emigration. 3. Aim, nature, strength, and value of the same. 4. The Germans of the colonial period, and their first settlements in New York, Pennsylvania, North and South Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Maine, and Massachusetts. 5. The political, ethical, social, and educational influence of the Germans in the colonial period. 6. Advance of the Germans to the West. 7. the Germans in the War of Independence. 8. development after the war, their absorption into the English. Rapp and its settlements. 9. the Germans in the period from 1815 to the beginning of the Civil War. 10. the political, ethical, social, and educational influence of the same during this period. 11. the Germans in the Civil War. 12. The Germans from the close of the Civil War to the present time, from the political, ethical, social, educational, and ecclesiastical point of view. 13. the Germans in the Spanish-American War, with special reference to General Schwan. 14. the German day. 15. concluding remarks." - From this it is clear what an enormous amount of material the book attempts to deal with, and we are therefore not surprised that at times the thorough and uniform treatment and processing of the material presented leaves much to be desired. Of D. Walther, the Missouri Synod and Synodical Conference, and their extensive school system, is dealt with from pp. 214, 411-416, 454-456, but the fact that the German church schools have contributed more to the preservation of German in America than any other factor might have been more emphatically emphasized. It is to the German schoolmaster, above all, that we owe the fact that the German language in America has not long since been relegated to the old age. And the man who has done more for the German language in America than any other is not Karl Schurz, but none other than D. C. F. W. Walther, who is also the real father of the school system of the Missouri Synod, which is still in full bloom today. Correctly is judged (p. 409) of the issue of the State school, "To make the public schools religious schools, that would be their ruin. The school, as a State institution, has not the issue of teaching religion in any way, as that is the business of the Church, nor would it be fair and right for an institution maintained by Christians, Jews, and infidels of all shades, and attended by their children, to inculcate the views of a particular class of taxpayers on religion and belief in the multitude of children entrusted to its care. . . . Add to this the fact that, from the outset, the Constitution of the country forbids any entanglement of church and state, and a religious state school is plainly unconstitutional." The author might also have emphasized with emphasis the fact that the Germans in particular, and especially the German Lutherans, theoretically as well as practically (e. g. in the school struggle in Wisconsin and Illinois), have stood up with a clarity and energy for the separation of church and state and complete religious liberty and equality guaranteed in the Constitution of our country, as no other part of the American population, indeed, that in this piece they have displayed a clearer insight into the very essence of Americanism than our first and most distinguished English fellow-citizens and even our highest officials. Via

Walther, of whom a portrait is also offered, Bosse p. 214 judges: "He was a comprehensive spirit and a leader such as there has been no second in a church community in America. In all doctrinal struggles he gave the direction; as co-editor of the church journals within the Synod he was a fruitful teacher of pastors and congregations; through an extensive correspondence the rich counselor of many who turned to him in difficult questions of conscience; as pastor of St. Louis Parish an eloquent, doctrinal, and moving preacher. Everywhere a theologian by the grace of God." The whole lot: "The German Church in the United States" is settled in 26 pages, and has therefore turned out rather sarbless. We can understand this, but at times at least a brief judgment should not have been lacking, e. g. p. 471 on the words of Archbishop Zardetti on the Roman Church and its final victory and triumph over the Protestants. In other respects, too, we have at times felt compelled to put question marks in the margin. F. B.

**Martin Luther.** A selection from his writings in the old language form with introductions and explanations together with a grammatical appendix. By Prof. D. Richard Neubauer. Two parts. Published by the Bookshop of the Orphanage, Halle a. S.

The purpose of this work is to introduce students at higher educational institutions and the wider circle of the linguistically educated and interested in Luther and Lutheran literature, as well as in his world of feelings and thoughts, and to offer itself as a reliable guide in all linguistic and factual questions. The first part comprises 292 pages and is already available in the "fourth, much improved edition". Apart from the prefaces, it first offers a detailed introduction on Luther as the founder of the New High German language. Then follow, with appropriate introductions and numerous notes: Mathesius' Life of Luther to the Trade in Indulgences. How the "Lutheran Lermen" began. The 95 Theses. To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation, etc. Of the Babylonian Captivity of the Church. Of the freedom of a Christian man. Martinus Luther to Hans Luther, his father. Letter to the Elector Frederick of Saxony. Sermon on March 12, 1522, against the iconoclasts at Wittenberg. Of the freedom of conscience and the duties of a Christian prince from the writing "Von weltlicher Obrigkeit". Heinrich von Zütphen's martyrdom in 1524. Preface to the Psalter. Epistle on Interpreting. On the Causes of Interpreting. A preface as an epilogue to the Interpretation. Samples of the translation before Luther, Catholic plagiarisms, and remarks on the samples from the old Bibles. The second part, which is in its third, improved edition, offers in 283 pages: Miscellaneous Writings of Luther of Secular Content. Fables, parables, sayings and rhymes. Poems from the years 1523 to 1538. Letters from the years 1522 to 1546. From the wisdom of Luther. Overview of Luther's language and its main deviations from today's usage. - For those who wish to familiarize themselves with the peculiarities of Luther's language, we recommend the study of this thorough work by Neubauer, the value of which lies primarily in the numerous, excellent notes, which act as highlights on the literary understanding of Luther.

F- B.

**Luther**. By Ed. Heyck. With 114 illustrations and 3 facsimiles. Published by Velhagen and Klasing. Price: M. 4.

This is the 29th volume of the monographs on world history edited by Ed. Heyck in connection with others published monographs on world history. The volume comprises 156 pages in large octavo and offers on fine glossy paper many excellently turned out pictures which one otherwise does not get to see at all or only very rarely. The text condenses a large material on a relatively small space. However, the facts are not always historically accurate, e.g. Luther's position on the Bible and its inspiration and authority. The authority of the Pope, the Fathers and Councils, and every other human authority in theology, however, Luther threw overboard, but not the divine-

authority of the Holy Scriptures. Of the words of Scripture, precisely because they are for him the infallible words of the Holy Spirit Himself, Luther said in the Lord's Supper controversy: "Mark and keep these things only well, for on the words stand all our foundation, protection, and defense against all error and seduction that have ever come or that may yet come. Every clear saying of the Bible had binding authority for Luther. No, Luther did not take the position of the moderns in theology and religion who want to be absolutely free of authority, free not only from all human authority, which Luther also wanted, but also from the authority of God in the Holy Scriptures, which Luther fought all his life as enthusiasm and rapture. Heyck himself shares the position of the moderns, which is especially evident from the evaluations on page 145 ff. and this position has not remained without influence on his presentation of the facts. F. B.

**Evangelischer Fürstenspiegel.** Züge für fürstlicher Frömmigkeit, collected and edited by Rudolf Eckart. Published by the Lutheran Book Society, Elberfeld. Price: II. 1.75.

Princes and princesses have often done Christianity no honour, either by their conduct or by their firmness of faith. For the sake of an earthly crown they have all too often bartered away their faith, their good conscience, and the crown in heaven. However, Eckart's excellent little book provides many edifying and faith-strengthening proofs that there have also been numerous splendid exceptions of truly pious and faithful princes and princesses. - Also sent to us from the publishing house of the Lutheran Book Society in Elberfeld: "Das Gotteserlebnis von Christian Hildebrand" (60 Pf.). F. B.

**History of Catholic Modernism.** By Johannes Kübel.
Published by J. C. B. Mohr. Tübingen. Price: M. 4; hardback: M. 5.

The author of this book of 260 pages is a Protestant, but modern theologian, as is evident everywhere from his judgments. But as far as the historical account of Modernism and the Pope's campaign against it is concerned, this book probably provides by far the most thorough information to date. Kübel introduces us to the Americanism of Hecker, the Jdeal Catholicism of Schell, the German Reform Catholicism of Ehrhard, Müller, Sickenberger, the journal "Das zwanzigste Jahrhundert," Franz Xaver Kraus, and others, furthermore to French Modernism and its representatives: D'Hulst, Archbishop Mignot, Bishop Le Camus, and especially the radical Loisy and his precursors; furthermore, modernism in Italy, represented by Minocchi, Bonomelli, Murri, and Fogazzaro, and others; and also modernism in England, as represented by Manning and Newman and Tyrrell, who was excommunicated shortly before his death. The description of Modernism is followed by Kübel's description of the fight against the Modernists inaugurated by Leo X in a genuinely papist way in the encyclical of 1903 and the Syllabus and the encyclical Pascendi of 1907, as well as how the Modernists reacted against it and especially how they judged the last writing, Pascendi. The preliminary result of the struggle, as "Doctrine and Doctrines" showed earlier, is the complete defeat of Modernism. And we are not surprised at this. From the beginning this movement carried the germ of death in itself, because the Modernists did not regard the powerful and cunning enemy at Rome as the enemy of Christ, but only as a reactionary against modern culture, and fought against him not with the sword of the Spirit, the word of God, but with the wooden weapons of "modern science." The modernists also lacked the certainty of victory and the holy courage to fight, which is born solely of the doctrine of justification by faith alone in Christ alone. Therefore, as soon as the pope became serious about the fight, the modernists took up the hare's pannier. The men who at first raised a lot of dust and talked big about "their own conviction" threw in the towel as soon as they smelled powder and crawled to the cross. Repeatedly

the Modernists have been compared to Luther; but, seldom without exception, they have all proved to be moral cowards. On March 1, 1899, Schell submitted; in 1893 Loisy ducked; and again in 1903 and 1904, as did Ehrhard and Tyrrell in 1907, though Loisy and Tyrrell were nevertheless eventually excommunicated. Gibbons and Ireland, too, who at first professed Hecker's Americanism, later cowardly withdrew. They also belonged to the Romulans, "who," as Kübel says, "are concerned first with power and last with truth". In 1896 Schell gave the new university building in Würzburg the inscription: "Veritati!" But he himself gave proof that the inscription should have read, "Dem Kadavergehorsam," or, "Sacrifizio dell' intelletto." Bishop Commer exulted, "Schell is shattered on the rock of Peter." And of Ehrhard Kübel says: "He washes the Roman pelt and yet does not wet it! The Modernist Schnitzer speaks proudly: "Rome thinks she may command science like the smoke-bearers." Others deride Pius X as the "little peasant of Risse" and as the shepherd who is himself a "sheep." But with the cry, "Fortior Qmnibus veritas!" they take to their heels. And if the Modernists fight without heart and weapon, the Pope fights cunningly, brutally, and with brute force. At all costs he wants to maintain the dogma that every Christian owes blind submission and cadaverous obedience to the Pope. And this purpose is pursued by the Antichrist even when he ostensibly stands up for truth to the Modernists. The highest good to the Pope is not truth, but tyrannical power to subjugate Christendom, the world. In short, in Pius X's struggles with the Modernists, one devil seeks to cast out another, and for the present Beelzebub has won the day. "Rome a parle; le debat est elos," said a French bishop, referring to the Modernist controversy. No one, he said, is now competent to pass judgment on the Pope. The whole fight is a mirror fencing of the devil to deceive the world that the Pope at Rome is the right, true Antichrist. F. B.

The History of the Jews in Palestine since the Year 70 A.D. By **Lic. theol. Dr. phil**. G. Holscher. J. C. Hinrichssche Buchhandlung, Leipzig. Price: M 1.50.

This sketch of 64 pages is an equally concise and interesting account of the fate of the unhappy, deluded Jews, who, after rejecting Jesus, the true Messiah and Son of David, were always ready to follow every false prophet and lying Messiah with rapturous fanaticism and at great sacrifice, only to atone for the aberration and outrage in terrible bloodbaths. The present sketch is an enlarged reworking of a lecture delivered by D. Hölscher in 1905. F. B.

The eternal rest of the saints. By Richard Baxter. According to the latest English edition. Cheapest complete edition. Eighth edition. Published by Chr. Belser.

This famous book, which has gained an almost unprecedented circulation in the English world, and which no one can read attentively without being tremendously moved, is now also much bought in Germany, as is evident from the repeated editions of the same. In spite of the many moving individual descriptions, however, the whole is carried by the Reformed spirit. In particular, the way to be assured of forgiveness is not presented correctly and with evangelical clarity. The legal nature of the English dissenter is also evident in other ways, e.g., p. 205, 226. And Baxter also unites with his Calvinism thoughts such as the following: grace works in stages: knowledge of sin, of the nullity of all creaturely things, of the necessity of redemption through Christ, an ardent desire for this redemption, faith, justification, sanctification. Yea, he writes, "Deceive not thyself with the imagination, as if Christ had already done all things, and left thee nothing more to do." The translation is "good, fluent, and responsive," but not without exceptions, e. g.: "Since thou art a father to us all."

F. B.

**John Calvin.** A picture of his life and times in the century of the Reformation. By D. Peter Paulfen. Published by Chr. B elf er, Stuttgart.

This writing of 177 pages was written for the 400th anniversary of Calvin's birth on July 10, 1909. As far as Paulsen's position is concerned, he agrees with Calvin in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, although he does not want to admit that Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is only Zwinglianism in disguise. Calvin's opponents in this controversy, especially Westphal, are therefore not fairly judged by Paulfen. In the doctrine of election, Paulsen disagrees with Calvin. But he himself falls into the opposite extreme and teaches the "free self-decision to turn to or away from God". Paulsen rejects the doctrine of election of Luther and the Formula of Concord with the well-known phrase: Luther was stuck in contradiction. That Luther's doctrine of election did not coincide with Calvin's, Paulsen admits. He thinks Melanchthon showed the right ways, and he asserts: "Without rightly understood synergism it never and never works; without any participation of man and his will, conversion and rebirth are an impossibility; they would be a purely physical-metaphysical act, devoid of any religious-ethical moment, nullifying the personality of man and degrading him to the animal or vegetable kingdom." "Alone more worthy of man and incomparably higher is the conception which preserves the personality of man, namely, that natural, sinful man has the capacity to grasp and hold fast the grace of his God extended to him in Christ. . . . As the drowning man participates in his salvation when he grasps the saving hand stretched out to him, so also the sinful man participates in his eternal salvation when he grasps the hand of grace of the merciful God stretched out day and night with the strength still remaining to him and is thus saved." But he who stands thus, and applies as the standard of theology the concept of what is worthy of man, is a rationalist, and cannot, of course, agree with the teaching of Luther and the Formula of Concord, which sets forth, without mediating, what Scripture says about universal grace and election. Paulsen also gives the following as traits of Calvin's teaching: That not all men are saved has its reason in the counsel of God. The secret lies in the fact that God has chosen some to eternal life from eternity, but has decided to consign others to eternal death. Eternal condemnation is not caused by the wickedness of men, but has its reason in the free will and arbitrariness of God. God ordains to damnation whom he wills. Adam's fall, too, was willed and predestined by God, and it is a chilling conceit to suppose that it is due to God's predestination. That the general promises had not power in all, was due to God, etc. Paulsen's remarks on Calvin's tyranny, iron discipline, legal church discipline, and cruel persecution of "heretics" are extremely interesting. (P. 33. 63. 67. 80. 102-109. 152.) Against Melanchthon Calvin took a mild and affectionate attitude, though he urged him in letters to come out against Luther and Westphal. Paulsen remarks: "It is only fortunate that Melanchthon did not live in Geneva, otherwise the Genevan reformer would probably have pressed him quite differently, and this friendship, too, might yet have gone to pieces like that with Herr von Falais." Falais and Calvin were for years the most intimate of friends. Calvin's love, however, turned to bitter enmity when Falais took charge of Bolsec, whom Calvin had had imprisoned for his deviation from the doctrine of predestination, and whom, if others had not placed themselves in the means, he would have delivered up to death. According to Paulsen, the double marriage of the Landgrave of Hesse caused Calvin much less concern than it did the Lutherans. Page 111 Paulsen proves Calvin to be dishonest. And that Calvin was able to speak more hurtfully than Luther, may be read p. 26. 44. 148, and p. 95, how Calvin exposed himself to the suspicion that he did not agree with the Athanasianum in the doctrine of the Trinity. Calvin's lax position in the interpretation of the Old Testament is touched on p. 39. With injustice Paulsen p. 176 gives credit to Calvinism for freedom of faith and conscience in America, and Ecolampad, who died in l531, he allows to live till 1553. Not rightly judged is Calvin's signature of the Augustana in 1539. Without being outwardly as a

Lutherans, Calvin could not, apart from other things, sign the "improbant secus docentes". Calvin's later declaration that he had signed the Augustana in the spirit of its author Melanchthon only reveals that he did not have a good conscience in this matter. If, finally, Paulsen thinks that Calvin is hardly behind Luther "in human and Christian greatness, as well as in ecclesiastical and world-historical importance," one need only read his own book to be thoroughly convinced of the contrary. F. B.

**AMURRU, THE HOME OF THE NORTHERN SEMITES. By *Albert T. Clay*, Ph. D. The Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia, Pa**. Price: P1.25.

Dr. Clay is Professor of Semitic Philology and Archaeology at the University of Pennsylvania. For years he was the assistant of Dr. Hslprechts, and has already made a name for himself by other writings on the finds in Babylon. The present book of 217 pages is subtitled: "A study showing that the religion and culture of Israel are not of Babylonian origin." Thus Clay has clearly stated the purpose of his book. The pan-Babylonists have hitherto led the great word and trumpeted it to all the world as a foregone conclusion: the religion and literature of Israel are not a revelation of God, for everything essential in them can be traced back from Babylon. Has D. Jensen even made the nonsensical attempt to prove that the personalities of Moses, Christ, and Paul were merely different editions of the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh! And when the learned world did not readily swallow this dose of folly as incontrovertible truth, he became rude, abusive, and pessimistic with reference to the intelligence of his scientific fellows. Now Dr. Clay comes along and puts a big, thick line through the whole Panbabylonism. The result of his investigations he p. 91 thus sits together: 'It is necessary, therefore, to differ radically from even those who, like Professor Rogers, say that 'the first eleven chapters of Genesis in their present form, as also in the original documents into which modern critical research has traced their origin, bear eloquent witness to Babylonia as the ancient home of the Hebrew people, and of their collection of sacred stories.' But, let me add, in appreciation of what the same writer says, even when he includes those elements which he thinks were borrowed from the Babylonians: 'When all these are added up and placed together, they are small in number and insignificant in size when compared with all the length and breadth and height of Israel's literature'. But the writer ventures to go even farther and to claim that the influence of Babylonian culture upon the peoples of Canaan was almost *nil*." Dr. Clay, alas, is also on evolutionist ground, but he has put an inglorious end to Panbabylonism.

F- B.

**THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT. By *Rev. J. B. Remensnyder*, D. D., LL. D. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa**.
Price: M. 1.00.

In our time, the central Christian doctrine of reconciliation and substitution is being attacked from all sides. It is still a nuisance to the Jews and a folly to the Greeks. Even more, this doctrine is ridiculed as that of the virgin birth and the deity of Christ. A God who must be propitiated by Christ's blood is a cruel, barbarous tyrant, and not the Christian God of love. "All references to bloodsacrifice" - writes one - "should be discarded from our devotional books and sacred hymns. They are relics of a barbarous and superstitious age and revolting to every intelligent man who believes that God is love." (P. 114.) So talk liberals in Europe and in American sects. And the positive ones, who still inwardly hold on to the old theology of reconciliation, often no longer have the courage to publicly stand up for this doctrine. It is therefore gratifying that D. Remensnyder opposes the liberals and advocates the doctrine of the substitutionary suffering and death of Christ. In the present writing there are many excellent passages; free from offences

against the Lutheran doctrine, but it is not. There are several proofs of this. On page 57 ff. the truth is denied, as far as we can see, that Christ's active obedience was also substitutionary. It goes too. far when page 65 says: "The Pagan sacrifices, then, are an adumbration of the sacrifice on Calvary. They are a subconscious seeking for the atoning blood of the Lamb." Perfectly true is it, which p. 74 is contested, "that His (God's) anger had to be appeased or placated." Correct also is no talk of election, p. 85, and of appropriation of the atonement, p. 89. p. 135 s. Remensnyder assumes gospel preaching and conversion in Hades. Unionistic sentiment emerges p. 164. The confession of inspiration from p. 165 is ambiguous. Pp. 169 and 175 faith, instead of being a mere means, is also considered as a condition of justification, e. g. in the phrase, "the atoning merits of Christ, given on condition of faith alone." Alarmingly, the sentence p. 26 reads, "Though theology may require a restatement of its truths to meet the changed conditions of the time, religion itself will not change." P. 84 is said of the passages of Scripture on common grace and election, "But both must be explained by the principle of the analogy of faith, so as to find the basal truth in which they harmonize." We say: the necessary exegetical result of both sets of passages is to be left by the theologian, unconcerned with harmony. There is also frequent and alarming talk about the "grand harmonious system" and the "intelligent theory to be formulated" (p. 92). P. 97: "A theory is only a rational explanation of a thing. If we believe a Christian truth, we must believe it rationally, and be able to give an intelligent explanation of the manner in which we hold it. That is, we must have a theory of it. . . . If as Christians we believe in a real atonement, we will have no difficulty in framing a very simple, definite theory of it in our minds." etc. P. 161: "The assumption that the formulation of Scripture doctrines into a logical system is a repudiation of them, would end all building upon the foundation of truth, would make a scientific theology impossible, and would forever fix the Christian doctrines in a Procrustean form, just as they were announced nineteen centuries ago. This would be the stiffest anti-progressive conservatism conceivable." (Compare also p. 167 f.) To these and similar unclear, vague, and partly false thoughts we emphasize the truth: Contemporary and systematic exposition of the doctrines of Scripture is not merely permitted, but necessary. However, we consider every rectification of the truths that result exegetically from the sedes doctrinae in the interest of harmony and a unified system to be a rationalistic falsification of theology. It is already wrong to approach Christian doctrines with the presupposition that they must form a unified, harmonious, rationally satisfying system. The theologian has the task of setting forth the doctrines of Scripture, and he has nothing to add to them, not even the connection or relative position of the doctrines to one another. The theologian also has only to determine the relation of the doctrines to one another, which results from Scripture itself. In short, every theological machination and every material going beyond Scripture is of the wrong kind. D. Warfield of Princeton has written a historically excellent introduction (XXX pages) to Remensnyder's writing. F. B.

A SHORT GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. BY *A. T. ROBERTSON,* A. M., D. D. Λ. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK. Price: M. 1.50.

This grammar of the New Testament is written for those who are familiar with the elements of Greek. Robertson did not intend to provide a comprehensive grammar of New Testament Greek, such as that of Winer, Blaß, or Moulton. But on the basis of these and many other grammars and grammatical works, including the most recent, such as that of D. Deißmann of Berlin, Robertson compiles from 240 pages the most important and most necessary for the beginner, and does so in an extremely short, clear, orderly and clear form. The book has therefore met with general approval, after seven months it has already seen its second edition and has been introduced as a text-book at various American colleges. F. B.

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D. D., LL. D. By *Adolph Spaeth,* D. D., LL.D. Vol. II. General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa, Price: ^1.75.

C. P. Krauth was without doubt the most important of the English Lutheran theologians of his time. This second volume of his biography treats in chapter X: Pastorate in St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, 1859-1861. chapter XI: Editor of the *Lutheran and Missionary,* 1860-1867. chap.

Chapter XII: The National Crisis, 1860-1865. Chapter XIII: The Literary Controversy against American Lutheranism, 1861-1867. Chapter XIV: The Crisis in the General Synod 1864-1867. Chapter XV: The General Council. Chapter XVI: Professor of Philosophy and Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, 1868-1883. Chapter XVII: Literary Activity during the Decade 1871-1881. Chapter XVIII: Journey to Europe, and Luther-Biography, 1880-1882. Chapter XIX: The End, 1881-1883. As soon as the first volume of this

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**Corrigendum**. The Synod of New Dort, reported in the previous number (p. 41), does not belong to the General Council, but to the General Synod, and was formed by uniting the Synod of New York and New Jersey, the Hartwick Synod, and the Franckean Synod. In a friendly letter W. B. assures us that in the Council only hosts are used in the Lord's Supper. At the same time he also informs us of the following saying from ***Young Folks,*** a paper of the General Council: "**The Missouri Synod is soundly Lutheran and prospers as the result.**" The words "8oundl^ Imtlmian" are emphasized by W. B. F. B.

Does Missouri place the symbols on an equal footing with the Scriptures? In General Synod papers printed some months ago, v. Albers claimed that in America, multiple Lutherans actually give equal authority to the Lutheran symbols as to the Scriptures. Albers seems to have the Missourians in mind, although he does not say so. If this is the case, however, Albers is in error, which we would like to take away from him. The Missouri Synod, from the beginning, and to this day, has acknowledged but one last, a priori certain and infallible source and standard of theology. And to this it has reckoned neither the writings of any theologian, nor any symbol of the Church, but solely and exclusively the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments. Symbololatry Missouri has ever and ever repudiated. In the ninth volume of "Lehre und Wehre," 1863 (p. 321 ff.), D. Walther makes the following remarks on the assertion of the Reformed Krummacher that the Lutheran Church is guilty of "symbololatry": "The first accusation which Mr. K. raises here against our Lutheran Church is therefore symbololatry, symbol idolatry, symbol worship. Truly, a grave accusation! With this, as is evident from the antithesis, he evidently wants to say that the Lutheran Church places its symbols next to God's Word and makes them equal to it. Fortunately for the accuser himself, however, he left it at that, and did not even attempt to prove his accusation. He suspected, it seems,

the insurmountable difficulties he would have to overcome if he wanted to make this attempt. For hopefully he had read what the symbols of our church say about themselves, for example, when it says in the Formula of Concord (which is, after all, the most feared popanza of the Calvinists): 'In this way the distinction between the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and all other writings is preserved, and the Holy Scriptures remain the only judge, rule and guide, according to which, as the only touchstone, all teachings should and must be recognized and judged, whether they are good or evil, right or wrong. But the other symbols and attracted writings are not judges, as the Holy Scriptures are, but only testimonies and explanations of the faith, as at all times the Holy Scriptures were understood and interpreted in disputed articles in the Churches of God by those then living, and the repugnant doctrine of the same was rejected and condemned.' Hopefully Mr. K. will know no less that there is also no theological writing recognized as pure in our Church in which this principle is not acknowledged in its entire scope. It is true that in the last century there were Lutheran theologians who, in a false zeal against the laxity of Pietism in the matter of public ecclesiastical confessions, allowed themselves to be carried away to the assertion that the symbolical books of our church have a **'mediata *ϋεοπνενστία',*** an indirect divine doctrine.

This was claimed, among others, by the well-known Orthodox scholars Samuel Schelwig and Johann Georg Neumann. The former, in his -Synopsis vontroversiuruin sub pietutis prastextu inoturum', writes, among other things, as follows: -Can the symbolical books be called God-breathed? Because the question is understood of indirect divine inspiration, we affirm the same.' These and similar assertions, however, as the licentiate must know, were immediately contradicted by the other theologians of our church, and not only by Spener and all the Pietists, but even by the most decided opponents of them, e. g. by one Val. E. Löscher. And not only this: all our orthodox theologians have continued to admit, without reserve, that only the doctrinal content of our symbolical writings is eternal truth; that, on the other hand, the form of them, the literary and historical remarks contained in them, and even their manner of proving, partake of the imperfection which attaches to all human works; and that, therefore, the obligation to the symbols is, of course, only an obligation to the doctrine contained in them. Thus, for instance, the spiritual Johann Konrad Dannhauer, who is known to have written such powerful polemical writings against the Reformed, writes: -May it be that such (symbols) do not make it obligatory to record all circumstances, modes of speech, proofs, citations, yet the doctrinal content (the substance of the doctrine) must be recorded as it is set down in writing, and not only in so far as it may appear to the private part to agree with Scripture; in which way, indeed, one might also subscribe to the Koran.' What, then, must have induced Mr. K. to attribute symbololatry to our Church? No doubt nothing else than because our church has regarded and still regards its confessions as human testimonies only, but not as testimonies of the errors of former times, but of the truth, and because it therefore does not give the one who is to become its servant the same impression as the one who is to become its servant.

If a person wants to accept the confessions of God, he must first ask himself whether he accepts them, not only in so far as they agree with God's Word, but also because they agree with God's Word, and whether he wants to administer his ministry according to them. But nothing can be more foolish than to accuse our church of symbololatry. If it were really symbololatry to assert that the doctrine contained in the symbols contained the pure divine truth, no preacher could say, without committing idolatry, that he had preached the pure Word of God to his congregation. Only a skeptic who has despaired of finding pure truth at all, who is always learning but never coming to knowledge, can see symbololatry in the assertion that ecclesiastical confessions contain the pure truth. If, then, Mr. K. has been repelled by the freedom he has in the Reformed Church to depart from its confessions, which, of course, he does not find in the Lutheran Church with respect to the confessions of the latter, and has been attracted to the latter, the reason why he does not want to be Lutheran but Reformed lies, among other things, in his skepticism. But whether this reason of his choice really speaks in favor of, and not rather against, the alleged merit of the church he has chosen, we think requires no proof." X priori true, certain, infallible, and authoritative are to us only the divinely inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and to all that is taught in these Scriptures we confess ourselves a priori and unconditionally. But to the symbols of the church, both ecumenical and specifically Lutheran, we do not confess a priori, but always only a po8tsriori, i. e., only after we have examined them according to Scripture and have recognized them as agreeing with Scripture. From the beginning this has been part of the abc of theology in Missouri. And that we have remained faithful to this position to this day, to which almost every number of "Lehre und Wehre" bears witness. We especially recommend to D. Albers the reading of the preface of this year and of 1904.

F- B.

v. Loy and the "in view of faith" in the Herford Catechism. In the section of Groß's "Doctrines of Distinction" on the Ohio Synod, it says on page 43: "In 1877, a preacher of the then Synod of Illinois asked for an expert opinion from the faculty in St. Louis and from that in Columbus as to whether the old Herford Catechism was pure in doctrine. The faculty, after rightly praising many things in this catechism, expressly declared that the expression 'in view of the faith', which is found in the catechism, was questionable, because it could easily lead to error! So spoke Professors Loy and Lehmann in July, 1877, and it was not until October, 1877, that the Missourians dealt with the election of grace. . . . And today Prof. Loy says that the expression 'in view of faith' is the only correct and justified one!" On this subject writes theof December 4 last, page 778:

"6ontrn8t ivitli tbi" n wttor troin Oootor üov, third U8 Ooyobsr 27- 1909: An rsgft to ^our8 ot lös tv6ntzl-üttb, not niuob nsscks to bs 8nid. lös mnttor nisntionock is n sgewinon ot tüs sagsrnsss vitb vbioü srrorists nrs xrons to 86126 upon nn^tbing tönt inigüt 866rn nn 6X0U86 tor tbeir psr8l8t6N06 in n bnck 6NU86. Xeitbsr Urot688or üisürnnn nor I 6V6r rejsotsck tÜ6 pürn86 "in viev ot tnitb" N8 nppUsck to owotion, nor dick I 6V6r, eitbor detors or attsr tüs 1nx>86 ot tbs ütwsouri L^nock into Lnlvinwm, (wolars

tbat expression to bo tbo oolv oorroot ono to sot tortb tbo Liblioal trutb oonoorniiiA eleotion. I did tbinlr tbat in a oatoobisin it süordd not bo usod to oxpiain tbo dootrine vitbont oioari^ oonneotinA it vitb 6brist as tbo inoritorious Around ok salvation, lost taitb sbould bo tabon as suob Zround; and I said so. Tbat is all tbat tbo Missourians oan ünd to iniplioato nie in tbeir lainentable deteotion troin tbe Dutberan dootrine. Nbat I ovor tanAbt or sanotioned tbe dalviaistio error ok Missouri is AlarinZl^ kalso.' " For the sake of full information we here read what is written about this matter in the "Lutheran" of August 1, 1881, page 116, under the heading: "Strange" by A. W., who thus writes: " 'The church newspaper of the Ohio Synod' (editors: Professors Schmid and Stellhorn) reports on July 1, -to keep abreast of how the Grace Election doctrinal controversy is developing . . . is developing'. Then this is also strange to her to record, that in a certain conference -the Missourians refused to sit and negotiate with Prof. Loy, President of the General Synod of Ohio,' and Prof. Loy was -yet -in all respects the same man whom the whole Missouri Synod had called to St. Louis three years ago to be their own professor.' 'Old and New' also found this strange enough to print in its number of July 15. Whether it was and is good for the Missouri and Ohio Synods that Prof. Loy did not accept the appointment, be silent. Likewise the question remains unanswered here whether Prof. Loy is still -in all respects the same man' as he was three years ago. But the following is noted as curious. In the year 1877, the Western District of the Missouri Synod heard the election of Grace. The report appeared, and probably everywhere people reached for it in eager anticipation. Or who should have received it and not read it? But what happens, and not too long after the appearance of this very report? At the beginning of the following year, the theological faculty at Columbus decided to confer the honorary title of 'Doctor of Theology' on Prof. Walther. At their -wish' he accepts it, and does not decline, as he once did, since from a university of Germany the same title was offered to him. On January 25, 1878, Prof. Walther was formally conferred the degree in the name of the Columbus faculty. This is curious and remains remarkable. Even in Columbus it will have to be admitted that Mr. D. Walther -is in every respect the same man' as he was then, that he has not afterwards become a -crypto'- or a genuine -calvinist, neo-Missourian' and the like. But this is what the Columbians now call him, who -is the same man in every respect.'" To the above the editors of the "Lutheran" add the following as an "after note by the editors:" "That Prof. Loh is now by no means -in all respects the same man' that he was when -e Missourisynod called him to St. Louis three years ago as their English professor, of this we have irrefragable documentary proof. The following is reported to us by Mr. L. Fr. Wolbrecht in Okawville, III: "One of the congregations belonging to the Jllinois Synod at that time, in which the so-called Herford Catechism of 1690 was to be introduced, wished to ascertain whether the Catechism also taught right' faith in all things. She therefore turned to L. Fr. Erdmann, at that time President of the Synod, so that he would have an exact examination of the Herford Catechism made. L. Erdmann requested from three

Pages of expert opinions on the same, namely by Pros. Loy, D. Walther and myself, which were also sent in. One question of the Catechism, No. 420, deals with the election of grace. It reads: "Are men then chosen by God out of pure grace, in view of faith in Christ, to eternal life? Answer: Yes. Eph. 1:3, 4, 5, 6." This question is objected to in the three opinions as not being in right faith. Prof. Loy's opinion, dated July 31, 1877, reads concerning it, "Question 420 seems to be insufficient in question and answer in regard to doctrine, and may easily lead to error." D. Walther, in his opinion of April 22, 1877, said: "The doctrine of election by grace is also not clearly described, when, for example, Question 420 says that God has chosen men in view of faith. There faith is made the ground of election, whereas God himself gives faith, and faith belongs only to the order in which God wants to make man blessed." In the expert opinion of August 4, 1877, which I supplied, it says: "Question 420, page 93, in regard to faith in Christ, is in contradiction with the preceding words: By pure grace.'" Is Prof. Loy the same man as he was in 1877? No. At that time he rejected the doctrine of election 'in regard to faith' as a 'doctrine easily led to error'; now he defends it, according to his former, officially expressed conviction of 'doctrine easily led to error,' as the only correct one. So it is not we, but he himself, who have been guilty of that 'nev ckeparture' of which he now dishonestly accuses us. If he had already in 1878 stood in the doctrine as he does now, those in our Synod who even then entertained and also expressed misgivings against Prof. Loy would not have allowed themselves to be reassured; indeed, the whole Synod would then have voted against him like one man. Incidentally, it is a fact that the blessed Prof. Lehmann also directed his students away from the old dogmatists into the Formula of Concord in the doctrine of election by grace, as one of his most excellent students assures us." So in 1877 Loy, in a well-considered expert opinion, judged that the sentence: men are chosen by God out of pure grace, with regard to faith in Christ, to eternal life, "could easily lead to error." And in 1881 Loy declared with the Ohio Synod: "In particular, we hold to be scriptural and symbolic (and thus well Lutheran) the doctrine of our fathers, that the ordinance of the elect to eternal life was made in view of faith, that is, in view of the merit of Christ taken by faith." D. Loy's letter of October 27, 1909, which is reprinted from the
Sachlage nicht. The impression remains that in the opinion of 1877 Loy wished 6X xrowsso to renounce the intuitn üäoi theory, and that at least until January 25, 1878, he had no objection to the doctrine of election by grace repeatedly advanced by Walther in the same year and earlier.

F. B.

General Justification. In his synodal sermon, the president of the Wisconsin Synod said, "So he (Christ) accomplished the Father's will by doing and suffering, paid our debt with his active obedience, and atoned for our punishment with his suffering obedience. Thus is the guilt and penalty of sin taken away. This he has done for the

the whole world of sin. And now God the Father has acknowledged Christ's deeds and suffering as complete satisfaction for all sinners through the resurrection of His Son, and has absolved the whole world of sinners from guilt and punishment, thus declaring them righteous. Just as through one man's disobedience many sinners were made, so also through one man's obedience many righteous will be made, Rom. 5:19. Through Adam many, namely all men, sinners; through Christ just as many, namely all men, righteous. Christ, the content of the gospel, is the Lord, who is our righteousness, Jer. 23:6. Thus in the gospel is revealed the righteousness that is before God. And as by sin there was enmity, so by this righteousness, which Christ purchased for all, is peace restored. Yea, he is our peace. He slew enmity by himself. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their sin unto them, and hath established among us the word of reconciliation - the gospel of peace. This is the substance of the gospel, Christ being our righteousness and our peace." (E. L. G. B., p. 210.) As often as we come upon this glorious doctrine, we must wonder how Iowaites and Ohioans can fight it! F. B.

At the meeting of the Icelandic Synod at Winnipeg, k. Bergman made an attempt to gain legitimacy for the liberal theology. However, a split occurred: 13 of the 76 members withdrew. ?. Bergman's radical position is evident from the following resolutions adopted by the Synod: "1. The Synod rejects the declaration that the Confessions are not binding, but only advisory, as L- Bergman maintains. The Confessions are binding until overruled. 2. Synod rejects the declaration that its pastors have the right to teach what they please, even on the basis of their Christian convictions. They may not teach anything under the protection of the Synod that overturns the doctrine to which they have committed themselves as pastors of the Synod. (3) The Synod denies the assertion that the religious conscience of man may judge the Scriptures and reject their words at will, as well as the inference that the Bible is not reliable. In contrast, the Synod declares that it holds to its confessional position that all Scripture is God's Word and inspired by God, and that the Bible is its own interpreter." When then the Synod refused to declare that pastors and laymen could remain members of the Synod, although they held to the liberal views of L- Bergman, the resignation took place. F. B.

The General Synod of the Uniate has voted to join the l'sckerul Oouuoil ok tbe Oburobss ok Obrist in ^msriou. The purpose of this "church association," representing over 18 million church members, is: "1. To present the fellowship and unity of the Christian church; 2. To unite the various church bodies of America in common activity in the furtherance of Christ's kingdom cause on earth; 3. To cultivate brotherly fellowship and mutual encouragement and instruction in the religious life and activities of the church; 4. To unite in the application of the teachings of Jesus Christ in the settlement of moral and social questions as they arise from time to time." At the I^ckersI Oounoit meeting in New York.

In 1905 and in Philadelphia in 1908 the Uniate were represented by five delegates. Ten Uniate districts recommended formal affiliation in 1909. The same was done by the delegates who had attended the meetings of the Lodoral Ocmncil and by the committee to which the matter was referred for consideration. Of the proceedings in the plenary of the Synod, the "Magazine" of the Uniate writes: "The report of the committee on this matter led to a very animated debate, in which the progressive element of the younger generation, so far as we noticed, was more in favor of joining the said federation, while the conservative, older element had more its objections to it. It was rightly pointed out that our church is generally too unknown in American Christian circles, and that affiliation with the Federation would serve to make the aspirations and aims of our church more widely known in English church circles. On the other hand, concerns were expressed that there was too much laxity in the Federation in matters of faith. On the other hand, however, it was emphasized that the Federation was most earnestly opposed to the admission of Unitarians, as deniers of the Trinity and the deity of Christ, as members of the Federation. Finally, a resolution was passed that the union with the Federation should be consummated, and five delegates should be elected to represent the Synod at the Federation. This, however, entailed that 850.00 per annum be paid into the treasury of the Federation for each delegate, besides the travelling expenses which will be incurred partly by the representative of the Synod at the meetings of the Board and partly by the delegates to the Federation. This led to a motion to reconsider the resolution, which in fact passed, and again led to some rather stormy debate. . . . Shortly before the close of the General Synod, however, the progressive element, which advocates full membership in the Federation, gained the upper hand, and the first resolution under reconsideration was again adopted. That resolution, mentioned above, also contains, as a precaution, the clause that if ever in the future churches denying the deity of Christ were admitted to membership in the Federation, the officers of the Synod would have the right to terminate our membership in the Federation. This is surely a clear sign that the Synod does not want to have fellowship with such denominations that throw out the cornerstone, the deity of Jesus Christ, and want to spread a flattened, deistic or pantheistic colored religion. We stand by the word, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ:" but is this the position of all Uniates, and also of the Protestant churches in their midst? And as to the lodoral vouoeil, even now liberal spirits belong to it the multitude. After all, all the sects that make up the Dodoral OouneU are formally peppered with liberal pastors and professors. Moreover, the Uniate clause only says that "the officers of the Synod shall have the right" to revoke membership. The Uniate General Synod should have made this mandatory for its officers if it did not want to leave a hole open for the future in this regard. F. B.

Of the founders of the "Evangelical Synod" in America, the "Messenger of Peace," p. 182, says: "Therefore the fathers of the Synod looked away from the

They did not accept the doctrines of distinction of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, which in the last analysis are only human opinions, and in humble submission adhered to the word of the Holy Scriptures alone. They knew that this would bring to bear what was important, and show to the quarreling parties the way to peace." Clear teachings of the Scriptures are hereby declared by the "Messenger of Peace" to be "human opinions," and on top of it all praises this reviling of divine teachings as humility and bowing to the Scriptures, and as the way to peace! F. B.

The Uniate "Messenger of Peace" (p. 86) confesses to the doctrine of evolution with the following words from a German magazine: "If the -natural selection' and the -struggle for existence' have proved untenable to explain the origin of species, the idea of evolution itself has remained. More and more the phylogenetic and species development of living creatures is recognized and acknowledged by virtue of the inner lawfulness inherent in it. Darwin's teaching has often been exploited in an anti-religious, materialistic sense. It seemed to guarantee that the most appropriate species in nature would come into being all by themselves. The -natural selection' and the -struggle for existence' seemed to make the creative activity of a God superfluous and to eliminate it. But apart from the fact that the significance of these moments has become very questionable, even if they had proved more tenable, the belief in God would not fall with it. Why should not natural breeding and the struggle for existence also form means in the hand of the Creator, by which he directs a planned development of natural creatures?" "We can calmly acknowledge what was great about Darwin without fear that the Christian faith is in danger of collapse." That any form of evolution of species is inconsistent with Scripture, even the "Messenger of Peace" will not question. If, therefore, he wishes to hold to the doctrine of evolution, he must. correct the Bible according to science. F. B.

TRe Laxtist LonZress gathered in New York late last year. At this meeting every Baptist, even radically unbelieving ones like Foster of Chicago, is allowed to air his views with impunity. The Methodist "Journal of Theology and Church" writes (p. 42 f.)r "This connection among Baptists has no official representation. It is probably the freest religious body, if it can be called such at all, that there is or can be. It has, I suppose, an organization governed by certain rules, but which are not really rules. The Congress came into existence some 27 years ago to provide a forum among Baptists, where any one might freely express his views upon the subjects there discussed, without being called to account for them. The fact that Prof. George B. Foster, D. v-, of Chicago, who became famous by his book

ok Oüristmnit/ created such a stir, was one of the speakers on the program, should serve as evidence. The -Congress' is the great speaking hall of Baptists. It meets once a year, in the month of November, and every Baptist has free admission to the same, and free speech at it. However, during the discussion of the objects which have been previously established and for which speakers have been appointed, he must submit his name to the chairman, who then gives him the floor if

the time for the particular subject has not expired. He shall have his time limit and must defer to the decision of the Chair in all circumstances. There is no appeal to the Assembly. Nor is it within the power of the -Congress' to pass any resolutions, endorse or reject any views. It allows the freest views to be expressed and leaves it to each individual to agree or disagree with what he hears. That swords are often crossed at the Congress hardly needs mentioning. But this is done in a completely fraternal spirit, without agitation of the mind, bearing in mind the principle which brought the -Convention' into being: -Everyone is entitled to his personal view!' and has here the opportunity to represent it publicly. Nor is the Baptist Fellowship in any way responsible (?) for the views expressed, and they may hardly be regarded as the expression of Baptist doctrinal views, though they indicate the direction in which the leading men of the Baptist Fellowship think. But others may think differently, and perhaps more fully represent the thinking of the fellowship. The Baptists have no binding creed, but rely on the Bible alone, and allow each person the right to interpret the Bible according to his personal convictions. They hold (represent) an absolute freedom of conscience, which is accountable to no man, but only to God, and recognise the Bible, His Word, as the norm of faith and life. This state of liberty, which the Bible itself advocates, may have its dangers and here and there lead astray. But the Christian who is enlightened and guided by the Spirit of God will always be set right by the Word, the Bible. The greatest security, even in matters of faith, lies in liberty, not in a human authority over consciences, but in a position responsible to God." "Baptists stand for the truth and do not fear it, even though views long held and dear to them may at times be shattered. Truth has made Baptists what they are today, and in 8truth lies their future decided. To grasp the truth more and more fully, and to secure it to the community, and make it more accessible to it, by a free discussion, this is the main object which the 'Baptist Oongross' has set for itself." To this extreme liberalism of the Baptists, then, the Methodist "Magazine" also professes. F. B.

Marian devotion. The "Luch. Herold" gives some information from a widespread Roman Catholic prayer book, "The Glories of Mary," from which one can clearly see that, according to the Roman view, it is easier to become blessed through Mary than through Christ. It is said that a Franciscan friar, Leo, saw in a vision two ladders leading to heaven, a red one on which Christ stood, and a white one on which Mary stood. At first people came who wanted to go to heaven on the red ladder, but it would not have worked. Then St. Francis came and admonished them to try the white ladder. Mary held out her hand to them, and they were in paradise in no time. Then it goes on to say, "He who does not serve Mary does not become blessed and loses the help of the Son and the whole heavenly court." One can commit a mortal sin and still be blessed by praying only one Hail Mary. And this was not written 400 years ago

but is found in a book that was printed in Regensburg in 1891. Another work is the manual for the veneration of Mary by the Munich Jesuit Pemble, in which it is shown, as in a calendar, what one should do day by day throughout the year in honor of Mary. A few samples may suffice: "January 12: sigh 'Mary' 20 times; January 25: kiss the earth as often as the word Mary contains letters; April 9: lick the name of Mary into the sand with the tongue; May 24: stand on one leg for a while; July 16: look at an image of Mary many times. July 16: to touch an image of Mary more often; August 30: to kiss the ground 63 times because Mary has turned 63 years old; October 13: not to see any part of the body naked when getting up or going to bed; October 24: to press a Marian coin to the heart; October 29: to win a lottery prize of the Consecration of Mary." Now one should only know how many days of indulgence he gets who does this humbug. This is Rome, and such are the Roman "good works". (Gotthold.)

## II. Abroad.

Concerning the Berbalinspiration, the "Hannoversche Pastoralkorrespondenz" p. 244 writes: "We know that Chemnitz, one of the authors of the Formula of Concord, does not represent the Berbalinspiration either, that it is not Lutheran at all, but that it is Reformed, that it has penetrated from the Reformed into the Lutheran-Orthodox theology, that it is therefore, although strictly represented by the Lutheran classical orthodoxy, yet not genuinely Lutheran-Orthodox. We know that even Calvin admitted errors in the Holy Scriptures, as far as they were historical, incidental statements, as do also in the present day representatives of Berbalinspiration, while, in my opinion, there can then no longer be any question of Berbalinspiration. Incidentally, it would be a mistake to think that verbal inspiration has been abandoned in the present day; it has not existed at all; pastors may have advocated it in former times, but it has not been done on the part of orthodox teachers either, apart from Hengstenberg and Philippi, for instance. And especially in Erlangen, from where most orthodox pastors have received their chief influence, one has always, as even Zahn does today, vigorously advocated a different Jnspiration doctrine than the Berbalinspiration." At the present time the most combated and hated doctrine is without doubt the doctrine of Berbalinspiration. And yet it is a clear teaching of Scripture. It is hated and fought against because it stands in the way of the modern mind, which recognizes no authority whatever. Once the dam of Berbalinspiration is pierced, modern rationalism can pour unhindered over the old orthodoxy. F. B.

The Evangelical-Lutheran Reorganization in the Province of Saxony decided in Gnadau: "1. whoever denies the bodily resurrection of the Lord Christ is not a Christian. Every Christian community that tolerates such deniers on its chairs and pulpits is digging its own grave. (3) We beseech and exhort all believing members of our national church to pray diligently to the Lord to avert such misery from our church." The sentence is missing: Christians have the duty to resign from national churches that tolerate such scoffers on chairs and pulpits.

F. B.

Of the modern-positive theologians of Secberg's school the liberal Weinei of Jena judges: "These men are in part so close to modern free theology in their views that one can read the same sentences here as there; but the sentences are ecclesiastically acceptable when found among recognized -Modern Positives', they are -ripping down' when we utter them. One may trace this miraculous play in the writings of a Jeremiah on the influence of Babylonia from the Old and New Testaments, as well as in the writings of Beth at Vienna and Stange at Greifswald in the systematic field; nay, the Master Seeberg himself, how far does he really stand from Harnack?" True it is: He who, with Seeberg, abandons the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture is inconsistent if he does not himself become a liberal theologian, or yet concedes theological equality to the liberals in the Church. F. B.

Concerning the life of associations, a pastor of the Breslau Synod writes in the "A. E. L. K.": "Some estimate the congregational life by the quantity of Christian associations; thus: the more associations, the more life I I am inclined to regard the associations as symptoms of disease in the congregational life; for I think that if a congregation is spiritually alive, then public worship is the natural evidence of the life of the congregation, and this life it carries into the home, so that church and home should be the places where the congregation chiefly displays its spiritual life. ... It may be due to social conditions that the associations become necessary, especially to counteract the social-democratic associations, but it remains the case that the family suffers damage under the associations. The Christian family is still a dam against the spirit of subversion; the enemies know this well, and that is why they seek to destroy this bulwark. But it is certainly tragic that even through Christian association life family life is not strengthened."

From the Lutheran Association. The "E.-L. F." writes: "In the -Köstliche Perle' Fr. Clausen (Todenbüttel) writes: -The tide of unbelief is rushing in our time with such force upon all Christendom that it is scarcely evident where God's Word is still to find a abiding-place in this world. National churches, free churches, sects, brotherhoods, fellowships - everything has more or less fallen into the modern spirit of the age. That is why we remain where we are and what we are. We of the Lutheran Association have a good conscience, bound as we are in God's Word, in all that may come. But the others, who openly or secretly reject God's Word, have their consciences guided by the delusions of men. On which side the preference lies requires no discussion for us.'" At best, the conscience of the Lutheran Association is an erring one.

The idea of a German Protestant Imperial Church seems to be taking deeper and deeper root in Prussia. The General Synod of the old Prussian provinces, currently meeting in Berlin, has just adopted with a large majority a motion in which the following is said about the Church Committee: "The General Synod trusts that the common interests of all German Protestants will henceforth be in good hands with the German Protestant Church Committee as its present permanent organ, which is called upon and authorized to speak and act in their name.

Becoming." "Henceforth", "now constantly" - that is to say: since the Church Committee has had its permanent seat in'Berlin and its permanent chairman in the Prussian High Church Council President, the time has now come to lead the idea of a German Imperial Church under the wing of the Prussian Union gradually one step nearer to realization. The representatives of the Lutheran High Church authorities, however, who would have had it in their hands to successfully prevent the execution of the call: "On to Berlin!", but who have followed this call with willingness, see from this rally of the Prussian General Synod how quickly the seed is being sown and how they themselves have become helpers for the ever-approaching birth of a Unionist Reich Church under Prussia's supremacy. Thus it was personalities from among them who inspired the resolutions of the "Closer Conference" of October 17, 1907, and thereby weakened the "General Evangelical Lutheran Conference" to such an extent that at its meeting in Hanover last year it did not utter a word of defense, not a voice of warning, against the danger threatening the Lutheran regional churches of Germany in the Church Committee. Now all that is lacking is that, after a measured interval, the powers of the Church Committee be extended, and we find ourselves unawares in the midst of the German Imperial Church of a unionist character governed from Berlin. Experience has shown that a planned, consistent approach always wins out over haphazard indecision and weak compliance. So reports the "Theologische Zeitblatt," organ of the Lutheran Federation, from the "Mitteilungen." Nevertheless, the "Lutheran Federation" does not break completely, but only halfway with the "General Lutheran Conference" and thus also not completely with the "German Protestant Church Committee".

Concerning the Prussian principle of parity, the "A. E. L. K." writes: "The positives continue to complain about being set back, and indeed some of their private lecturers, no matter how scientifically proven they may be and how well they may have demonstrated their teaching ability in the lecture hall, can spend more than one lustrum, indeed one lustrum after another in the waiting room. On the other hand, the moderns, too, are dissatisfied; they no longer want any parity at all, but decision solely on the basis of scientific ability. That this is to be sought only in their ranks is taken almost for granted by most of them. Or has a complaint ever been heard from them when one of their own has been appointed?"

As a substitute for Luther's catechism in school, the Saxon teachers recommend the book "Im Sturm des Lebens" ("In the Storm of Life"), which also contains the following song: "When the midday woman creeps through the cornfield, Quietly and swiftly, Like the snake so swiftly, like the polecat so lightly, Beware, child! In her apron she carries the jacks away half-dozen by half-dozen, And hides them in a secret place that no one knows. She makes an ointment in a soup pot, she puts poppy seeds in it. And she'll wash your frizzy head down to the b,ein. Then you'll be enchanted, you poor wretch, Think of it! Heart gone, mind gone, memory gone, All at once you know no more Parents and home, you disgrace! And peep at the merry maidens, You mustn't!" Of this poem the religious commission of the Leipzig Teachers' Association judges: it is

is completely on a par with the biblical story of the fall of man. In the same book, an evening prayer reads: "Dear God, out of your house look many little stars. Little stars, bright and pure; Let me be like the stars. Give the little angel a kutz, That must clean the little stars, Send it then after me to earth, That I may be ever more glad." With piety, at last, mind and spirit are lost. F. B.

The Danish L. Madsen recommends a mission among unbelieving pastors when he writes in the community journal "Auf der Warte": "How would you feel about the plan to start a mission among unbelieving pastors? There is missionary work among unbelieving students, unbelieving merchants, unbelieving young girls, why not among unbelieving pastors? If it is of importance if a layman is converted, it is of much greater importance if a pastor is converted. For surely there is something fearful about an unbelieving pastor! Not only is he himself lost, but what a hindrance he is to those whom he is destined to lead and guide!" L. Madsen evidently does not mean this to refer merely to liberal pastors. F. B.

Coeducation. The Ministerial Director D. Schwartzkopff gave a lecture in the Cologne Association on the Prussian girls' school reform of August 18, 1908. In particular, he went into great detail on the question of community education. He reported that no less than 56 Rhenish cities had applied to the educational administration for permission to admit girls to their higher boys' schools. The Minister, however, had rejected all of these requests. The opposition to co-education was based first of all on the following three considerations, which started from the interest of the girls themselves. 1) The educational influence of women is indispensable for the education of girls; the admission of girls to boys' schools, however, excludes this female participation, unless one wishes to draw the conclusion that female teachers should now also be employed at the higher boys' schools. 2) The entry of girls into boys' schools would lead to an overburdening for them, since it would require them to master the subject matter in six years instead of seven, and to endure 36 instead of 30 hours per week. 3. since the development of girls follows a different curve than that of boys, only the girls' school curriculum adapted to this curve can be truly beneficial to their physical and mental health.

To the liberal "Bossische Zeitung", which had published a theologian's scathing attack on the Berlin pastors, the "Executive Committee of the Berlin Pastors' Association" responded as follows: "1. The enormous workload that takes up the mental and physical strength and time of the Berlin pastors from early in the morning until late in the evening forces by far the majority of them to exercise a restraint with regard to participation in baptismal and wedding dinners and in social life that is quite undesirable for many members of the congregation. With very few exceptions, the Berlin pastors can only in rare cases respond to invitations to baptismal and wedding dinners, despite the urgent wish of the family in question. 2) The very modest income - especially in the case of larger families - and above all the principles which are derived from

The rules which are self-evident to the Gospel, and which are authoritative for Protestant clergymen, secure them from the danger of becoming accustomed to gluttony. That pastors receive and accept two or three invitations to dinners every evening during the winter, and do not return home until 2 o'clock nearly every evening, is an accusation which probably does not apply to a single Berlin clergyman. What is true of a great many of them, however, is the fact that, in order to fulfill their official duties, they are often to be found at their desks late into the night. (3) The exemption of pastors from the payment of church taxes, which exists by law, gives them a financial advantage which is out of all proportion to the sacrifices which they are morally bound to make for the sake of love. 4. the statement that 'Fromme! brought about his own health ruin by being too indulgent in taking part in family celebrations with his effervescent sociability', we consider to be a sign of impiety and also not provable; the almost unprecedentedly extensive official activity of this man alone sufficed to put an end to his life after 68 years. 5. That some pastors are -too proud to go to a Social Democratic meeting because there their stand might be criticized rudely', that -they stand idly by while ever new multitudes separate themselves from the church', that -some pastors ask their parish councils for ever new extraordinary support', because the -worldly pastor's wife plays the great lady', we must call completely untrue as long as a number of cases are not precisely indicated and described to us in which these accusations are true. (6) It is not true that the majority of the Berlin clergy are still enjoying the gifts of love; by far the majority (three-fourths) have renounced them. (7) If the Berlin theologian's object is to prevent the secularization of the pastors, he can accomplish his object much better than by such general accusations, by submitting the individual cases to the authorities, or better still, to the oensura. kratrnm. His publication can only serve to add new charges to the many unjustified ones against the pastorate, and to create the appearance that the accusations, which may not be entirely unfounded in the case of one or another, apply to many, indeed to most, pastors." The social-democratic "Vorwärts" exploited the slander in the "Vossische Zeitung".

In a letter to the Bavarian episcopate the Pope says: "In a special way We express Our appreciation for the way in which you have upheld the rights of the Church in the school question. It is necessary for the proper education of children that the elementary schools should remain under the inspection and vigilance of the parish priests; the opponents of ecclesiastical supervision of schools only wish to have it removed in order to fill the tender minds all the more freely with an education which is devoid of the Christian spirit. You will be accompanied, We doubt not, by the applause of all good men in your endeavors to suppress these attempts, the more so as you have even the civil laws on your side in this matter." Thus the liberals give the Pope an opportunity to parade the Christian mask and to fortify his tyranny. , F. B.

We hear again and again of struggles for conscience in the Catholic Church, also after the defeat of Modernism. Several seminarians recently resigned or were dismissed from the Rottenburg seminary. One of them, Funk, writes in the "New Century", the magazine of the Modernists, an essay about Bishop Hefele, who, as is known, was a decided opponent of the Vatican infallibility dogma, but later submitted to the authority of the Church, or rather of the Pope, and describes the conflict in which Hefele found himself - an example for many - as follows: "In the difficult days of the winter of 1870/71 two consciences were in conflict in Hefele's breast: the individual-moral and the ecclesiastical. It is a great misfortune for centuries that the Church succeeds in producing in the Catholic, through education, this regrettable division of conscience. Catholicism suffers incurably from this. Such conflicts may have the following results: either the moral personality triumphs over suggestion and habituation; like a redeeming morning, the insight falls into the two-fielded soul: the Church demands too much, sins against truth, when it stamps its human as divine; or the ecclesiastically trained conscience strangles the personal - we honor all honest conviction and respect all sacrifices, but regret such unprofitable burnt offerings; or finally, reason creates a compromise: outwardly ecclesiastical, inwardly free-such half-measures carry their punishment and hell in themselves I We deplore them only when they are less the work of cool calculation than of idealistic delusion, which always appeals from the present church to a future one, without realizing that by this very lack of consistency, honesty, and courage, what is hoped for is preventedl" (Nef.)

From Norway the "A. E. L. K." reports: "In recent times the problem of the separation of church and state has arisen. A new party frame has been created. As at the time in Geneva, here too the motives are of a very different nature. The religiously indifferent radicals, the Free Churchmen, the sects, and the leaders of the State Church are joining hands for the same position. The bishops hope to help the positive doctrine to triumph more energetically through the separation and to be able to expel liberal pastors, which is now made impossible for them by the Minister of Culture with the Chamber behind them. Thus it is understood that the Lutheran Church, for which the question of constitution is very much secondary to the question of doctrine, has taken up arms in order to fight for freedom from the State, in order to found a party for this idea in the Storthing. Even the politicians, tired of quarrelling, are in favour of it, especially Michelsen, the hero of the coup d'état of 1905. A complete draft of the constitution has been drawn up by an ecclesiastical committee and submitted to the government, a proposal which has been generally applauded in the collegiate offices. The Government has replied by appointing a State Commission to examine it. It is jokingly called the Funeral Commission. Agitations in the party leaflet, the Christian "Wochenblatt der I. M/, are intended to prevent the joke from becoming true. The mass of the people in conservative ponderousness are still against it."

The Synod of the Evangelical Free Church of France has adopted in SainteFoy a new confession to which both the liberal and the positive

Wings agreed. The confession says: "Acknowledging the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures tangibly given to every believer through the witness of the Holy Spirit, and affirming the spiritual authority which belongs to the Bible as a record of God's progressive revelations for the salvation of mankind, we worship the living God who has revealed himself as Father in Jesus Christ and who desires to dwell in our hearts through the Holy Spirit." "In faith we unite ourselves to Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, the Savior, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead. By his holy life, by his redemptive sacrifice on the cross, by his glorious resurrection, he has purchased for us peace and union with the heavenly Father. He is the Living One who saves without ceasing by His continuing work upon souls and in the world." The "Reformation" sees in these sentences a victory for the positive, and a clear profession of the old faith. But there will be few Modernists who will not put up with the above phrases. The confession of Sainte-Foy is a comparison between liberals and positives.

F- B.

The unbelief of the Roman priests in France is also evidenced by the fact that of 260 priests who have resigned in the last two years, 247 have fallen into the arms of manifest unbelief. Very few of the priests who have so far left have become good Protestant preachers. Even among the better priests, the reason for leaving is not distress of conscience, as with Luther, but the vow of celibacy. The 06UP7-6 Ü6S has therefore seen itself compelled to stop its activity in 1908, because almost all leaving priests do not want to know anything more about Christianity. From the last annual report of the ds "the "Reformation" reports among other things also the following

We immediately removed those whose virtue left much to be desired. But what could we do for the others, for those who had gradually led the teaching of their church into doubt, and even for those who naively confessed to us that they had promised marriage to one of their female confessionals? Nor is the title of former priest a recommendation, even in evangelical homes. This impossibility which we have experienced of finding employment for honorable priests has often been a cause of great discouragement to us." . . . "However, the inquiries have also brought us together more than once with priests whose piety has consoled us for many disappointments. These priests, after long months of collection and self-examination, after months of devotion and prayer, have then requested us to give them the means that they might preach the Gospel which they had come to know. For such cases our work was made, and for them its cessation may be to be regretted. But we must confess that these cases are becoming more and more rare, too rare to maintain a costly work on their account. Without special organization for it, the Protestant Church will have to provide for every such case, as often as it occurs." The departing priests have for several years mostly joined the secular association "Lotion niniool on ^ssoointion des ^.neions Brotros ontüolignos" (Friendly support or

Association of former Catholic priests). Roman superstition, by its very nature, turns into manifest unbelief every time its adherents have reached a certain stage of culture. Of this France now furnishes the best evidence. It is therefore vain delusion when Protestants now also look to papism as a bulwark against modern unbelief. The papacy can keep up the pretense of being a stronghold of faith against the powers of materialism and rationalism only as long as the priests succeed in keeping their subjects in ignorance and superstition. Nor can Rome be considered as the precursor of Christ and the evangelical faith, but only as the mortal enemy of the same, as the Antichrist, who would a thousand times rather deliver up his followers to manifest unbelief and hell than to Christ and his Gospel. Luther is right in judging "that the pope would rather see all Christendom lost and all souls damned, before he would reform himself or his own a little, and have a measure set to his tyranny." F. B.

The "A. E. L. K." writes of **the oppression of the Protestant mission in Madagascar**: "Christians are still very much inhibited in their funerals, or actually: Christian funerals are generally made impossible. For there is still the regulation that the funeral assembly may neither sing nor recite liturgical prayers; songs and prayers may only be spoken by the missionary, who usually lives very far away; he alone may also give an address, which, however, must be communicated to the administration beforehand, and in the vast majority of cases there is no time for this. In general, all religious practice is forbidden at the grave, and is permitted only in the house of the deceased or in the church. The pagans, however, may practice all their pagan funeral customs, sacrifices, etc., unhindered as before. The Protestant mission still has to struggle against the superiority of the Roman missionaries, who suspect them of not having the religion of the French, and four-fifths of the Protestant missionaries are not French. The French administration is also hostile to the Protestant missionaries, because they seek to form personalities and awaken consciences. Therefore, they have lately been hindering evangelical school teaching in particular. In Jmmerimaujaka there had been a school with 40 pupils since 1907, which had to be enlarged because of the new influx of pupils. The new building had to be connected to the old one and therefore the old roof had to be partly demolished. What does the administration do? It has its official organ declare that the school building has been destroyed and therefore the school has been excavated. And since then the school has been closed. A new request will be necessary to reopen it, and the answer will be four to five months in coming, if it is given at all. In another place in the same area, Manazari, a school that had 30 pupils and that they wanted to enlarge was simply closed, although it was built and kept entirely according to the regulations. The administration simply used the request for enlargement as an inducement to close the school, and today, after seven months, the school is still closed. And all this is happening under the suzerainty of the country that has 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' written out of its banner."

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. March 1910. No. 3.**

## The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53.

(Continued.)

The second part of the Jeshian sermon on the Suffering Messiah, 53:4-6, reads in literal translation, "Verily our sicknesses He bare, and our sorrows He unloaded; but we thought Him stricken, smitten of God, and bowed down; yet He was pierced for our iniquities, crushed for our iniquities; the punishment was upon Him for our peace, and by His weal we were healed. We all went astray like sheep; we were turned every one to his way; and the LORD caused the iniquity of us all to fall upon him."

Luther remarks on this in his Scholien zu Jesaias: **Hactenus passionem et glorificationem Christi descripsit, jam addit, quid misera illa et laboriosa specie effecerit. Atque hic est articulus justificationis, credere Christum pro nobis passum, sicut Paulus quoque dicit: Christus est factus maledictum pro nobis. Neque enim satis est, nosse quod Christus sit passus, sed sicut hic dicit, credendum etiam est, quod nostros languores tulerit, quod non pro se, neque pro suis peccatis sit passus, sed pro nobis, quod illos morbos tulerit, illos dolores in se receperit, quos nos oportuit pati. Atque hunc locum qui recte tenet, ille summam Christianismi tenet. Ex hoc enim loco Paulus tot epistolas, tot sententiarum et consolationum flumina hausit**.

As the prophet 53:1, in the expression, "our preaching," joined with all his professional associates, all the preachers of the gospel; as, v. 2. 3, in the words, "We saw him, but there was no appearance that pleased us," "and we esteemed him nothing," he gave voice to the contemporaries of the Messiah; so now, vv. 4-6, he lets those speak with "we," "our," who first misjudged, but then rightly recognized, the great sufferer, by including themselves, and the penitent, believing sinners at the same time lament the general human misery, vv. 4. 5, confessing

The iniquity of all mankind and what Christ did for the good of all mankind: "we all went astray" - "and the Lord sent out of him the iniquity of us all". V. 6. But this form of speech is only a dressing of the prophetic thoughts. This confession of the church of God is the new, wonderful tale, which many heathen hear; it is the content of the JESAIC sermon, a high revelation, which has never come into any man's heart or mind.

The **satisfactio vicaria** is expressed here in an unmistakable and concise way. The prophetic discourse proceeds step by step, upward, until it reaches the summit in v. 6, or we may also say, leads us step by step deeper and deeper into the divine mystery of our reconciliation. From the present passage of the Isaianic prophecy have flowed, as Luther remarked in the above, so many Pauline epistles, so many streams of thought and consolation. It is not necessary that, when we speak of these great things, we should always interpret only Isa. 53:4-6, and observe the same order of thought. But a Christian preacher will only then promote and ground his audience in the right knowledge of Christ and salvation in Christ, if he so carefully specifies, separates and separates the terms, as Isaiah did here, while it does not serve much for edification if he mixes up the common Christian ways of speaking.

It is called v. 4: XXX XXXX. The compilation of the pro nomina XXX XXX is is significant. **Imprimis observandum est pronomen: Nostros dolores, nostros languores ipse portavit**. Luther. Yes, **nostros - ipse**. He - ours. Our sicknesses He hath borne. Similarly 1 Pet. 2, 24: ***τάς αμαρτίας ημών αυτός άνήνεγκεν - ημών αυτός*.** This is the first, next, most general thought: the Servant of the Lord stands in our place. He is our substitute, our all, all men's substitute. He leads the cause of men. This one man, the root womb, the Virgin Son, the Son of Mary in the place, in the part of the whole human race! Of this rice v. 2 was said to go forth "before Him," "before the Lord." The whole earthly course of the Messiah, His life, doings, sufferings, was subject to the eyes of God, the special eye of God. God Himself had sent His servant to carry out His counsel and will on earth. And now we hear that the whole life, activity, suffering of the servant of the Lord was meant for men; he sought nothing for himself on earth. Thus it was the counsel and will of the Lord that his servant should act in his own interest and at the same time in the interest of men, that he should bring to pass the bargain which God had with men. Christ our representative before God! And so the Lord Himself appointed this servant of His in the place of men, and

Christ Himself took upon Himself the cause of men. Men did not choose this substitute for themselves, did not set out to find a substitute at all. How should they have come up with this idea? Men did not want, seek, desire a Saviour at all. But since God of His own free will has ordained and given Christ to men as their substitute, since Christ of His own free will has put Himself in the same place as men, it is God's earnest, holy will - and what a wholesome will! -that men should recognize, acknowledge, accept Christ as their Substitute. When we are pressed, when we cannot come to terms with God, then we should, then we may, place Christ with God on our behalf, and confidently hand over to Him our whole business, the bargain we have with God. If, of course, we let our own thoughts rule, then it alienates us, then it does not occur to us that another should fight out what we ourselves have to settle with our God. But the XXX at the head of the sentence, the "Forsooth," "Verily," "Forsooth, He bore our sickness" - He stands in our place, that gives us courage to enter into this blessed exchange and change that God offers us.

As our Substitute, the Servant of the Lord took upon Himself that which was foreign to Him and our own, and these were first of all "our diseases," "our pains:" XXX XXX XXXX XXX

XXXX XXXXXXX Older commentators take "sickness", "pain" here figuratively, of our spiritual infirmities, of our sins and iniquities. But the prophet speaks of this only in v. 6. There is not the slightest indication in the text for the figurative version, and the context compels us to understand "sickness," "pain," in the same way as before, where the servant of the Lord was called the man of sorrows, who was acquainted with sickness. Sickness, infirmity, suffering, pains of body and soul, have been the common human lot and fate of all Adam's children since Adam's fall. All the woe of this life, and finally the woe of death, is the result of man's sin. Now there was a man who had no sin, and therefore no right to the sad inheritance of men, that is JEsus, Mary's Son. Nevertheless, Jesus also walked in poverty and lowliness and shared in the sufferings of mankind. But he did not only share in the suffering of mankind, did not only become their companion in suffering, but took their pains and illnesses completely upon himself, carried them alone. The verb rwl, as Delitzsch rightly observes, includes both in itself, tollere and **ferre**, "to take upon oneself" and "to bear." The verb XXX is used especially of bearing burdens. Christ took upon himself the burden that men had to bear, not only helping men to bear their burdens, but taking the whole burden upon his back.

and thus taken from the people. The whole weight of human sorrow and misery was upon him. Thus is explained this singular, measureless suffering, which made him quite unlike men and so contemptible. Christ came to save men from destruction. But death and destruction is the inevitable consequence of sin. Sin is a deadly snake poison and brings death and destruction upon man. And so Christ, according to God's wonderful counsel, drew the inevitable consequences of sin, death and destruction, from his person, appropriated them to himself, and thus delivered us from destruction. This, of course, must not be understood in a crudely realistic way, as if Jesus himself had lived through all the bitter experiences of each individual human being. He lived through only one human life, suffered once, died once. He bore the suffering and woe of the whole human race in the same way as one can bear the suffering of all. When the church of God sings and says in her passion songs of "the thousandfold plagues" of her Redeemer, it is, as the ancients rightly remarked, not to be taken extensively, but intensely. Out of the thousandfold plagues, agonies, pains of the human race, there was mixed, as it were, a bitter drink; this was the cup which JEsus was to taste and would taste. The total woe of all mankind was concentrated, as it were, from this one point, the Passion of JEsu. The suffering of Christ was, as Delitzsch expresses it, "the exodus and outburst of our self-inflicted woe." Or we may also say: the suffering of Christ was, as the Church has expressed herself from of old, a **compensatio,** an equivalent for the sufferings, evils, plagues of all men. In order to understand this correctly, however, it is not enough to take into account all that Jesus suffered, from his birth to his death, but at the same time we must look at the person who suffered. It is said, "Verily our sicknesses hath E r borne." The He, XXX, is emphasized. Who is this He? Certainly a man like us, a single man, the Son of David, the Son of Mary, but a man without sin and a man who was even more than a man. This He, XXX, is the faithful, smelling servant of the Lord, who only acted wisely and rightly, 52, 12, the root womb, which, contrary to the louse of nature, sprouted from the human race. 53:2, We recall what we have already noted in considering the first part of the Jeshuaic sermon. The three noble prophecies of the prophet, 7, 10 ff., 9, 2 ff., 11, 1 ff., form, as recent exegetes also recognize, a trilogy, which puts the person of the Messiah in the light. Now, however, the statement of the rice, of the root-sapling 53, 2 evidently draws from the similar statement 1'1, 1 and thus also from Isa. 7 and 9. The Messiah of Israel is the tender rice that sprouted from the cut off tribe of Jesse, is the virgin son Immanuel, is himself

the great, strong God. Also in the second part of the prophecy the Messiah appears as the Lord Himself, not only as the servant of the Lord. Right in the beginning, Is. 40, 1-11, it is said that the Lord Jehovah Himself comes to His people to redeem His captive people, to atone for the iniquity of His people. The testimony of the eternal deity of the Redeemer, contained in the prophecy, also in that of Jeshua, belongs to the sun-clear sayings of Scripture. Only he who willfully shuts his eye to this light does not see it. This, then, was the "He," XXX, who bore our sicknesses and pains. And that now the righteous suffer, for whom suffering is as much an unnatural thing as it has become second nature to the sinner, the tender, holy rice of Jesse's stock exposed to the poisonous breath of death of this world, a pure, undefiled human nature subjected to the suffering of death-this is a nameless, unspeakable woe, which no sinful, mortal human child can sympathize with. And finally, that God in the flesh, that the only blessed God suffers and dies, this great misery: God Himself is dead, God's death, God's torture, God's blood - that is a quite incomprehensible, infinite, unfathomable depth of suffering, which swallows up the whole misery of the human race. In this way the Church of Christ, too, in her passion songs, which likewise flowed from Isaiah 53, worships the great mystery of Christ's sufferings: "Thou, O thou hast endured blasphemies, mockery and scorn, spittle, blows, cords and bands," but she adds: "Thou righteous Son of God," which gives full weight to the agonies and pains of Christ. Or, "The pious dieth, so rightly and justly walketh; the wicked liveth, so against God mishandleth; man forfeiteth death, and is escaped, God is caught." This is the compensation, the **compensatio**: the pious dies, God is caught; this weighs infinitely, this strikes through; thus the wicked escapes death and remains alive. The pious singer sings still further, "I cannot reach it with my senses, with what yet thy mercy to compare." Yes, this is the most tangible side of the incomprehensible exchange and change, the divine mercy. God had mercy on us. God wanted to save us from death and destruction in this very way. This we accept, this we rely on, this is our comfort and support in the midst of the misery of this life, our tryst in death.

But how? So the misery is not yet completely gone? Yes how? Is our burden really lifted? Experience seems to contradict it. Work, toil, trouble, sorrow, pain, sickness, woe, is still our daily portion. And so it will remain as long as we live. Nor will we be spared the woe of death. The evangelist Matthew gives us information about the fulfillment of our prophecy. He reports that one evening Jesus healed many sick people, cast out many devils, and then remarks,

That this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaias, "He - αυτός - hath taken upon Him our infirmities, and borne our sicknesses." Matth. 8, 16. 17. JEsu's healings of the sick were not only proof of His divine omnipotence, but also evidence that JEsus had taken all our sicknesses and pains out of Himself to bear them, to suffer them, to atone for them. These sorrowful consequences of sin could not be resisted and controlled in any other way than by bearing, enduring, atoning. And this Christ did in our stead. The whole life of Jesus on earth from the beginning was a continuous suffering, and a substitutionary suffering, a bearing, an expiation, a compensation for the damage caused by the sin of mankind. But it soon became evident that men had been relieved of their burden. Wherever the Redeemer stood, wherever he walked, wherever he let himself be seen and heard, wonderful and unheard-of things happened: the sick were healed, the afflicted were healed, the dead came to life. The powers of destruction had lost their right and power to man. Of course, this was not yet a perfect and final redemption. The healed, the recovered, the resurrected were not entirely removed from the misery and wretchedness of the earth, and eventually died and died again. What happened in Christ's time, that the deaf heard, the dumb spoke, the blind saw, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the dead were raised, was a kind of prelude, a foreshadowing of things to come, of the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, of the **restitutio in integrum,** Act. 3, 19-21, of the regeneration, **παλιγγενεσία,** Matth. 19, 28, to the blessed time, which

The fruit and effect of the Passion of Jesus is that there will be no more suffering, crying and pain, that death will be no more, that what is sick, sighing and pleading here will walk fresh and glorious there. Such a state of paradise cannot be established on this earth. Sin has changed and corrupted the whole nature of man and the state of creation, made man's body mortal, and subjected the whole creature to vanity and cursing. Thus this mortal body must first cease and decay, and heaven and earth pass away, before that which is perfect, immortal, incorruptible, can appear. And why the Son of God, when he came out of the earth to redeem mankind, did not immediately put an end to the whole evil world and establish the kingdom of glory, is a question in itself. The servant of the Lord had another mission to accomplish, of which the prophet speaks in the further course of his prophecy. But this much is certain: because Christ has borne our sicknesses and pains, we are already **de jure** and inwardly free and released from all our burdens and bonds. The sorrow and woe of this time no longer lie upon us as an oppressive burden. It is no longer our own. This

Earthly vale of tears is a stranger to us; our home is elsewhere. And it lasts but a short while, and then all this is gone. Yes, we Christians, who have rightly recognized Christ as our Substitute and Redeemer, see in the suffering of this time no contradiction, no opposition to the glory to come, but rather the means and the way to our final and actual redemption. Daily toil and labor, earthly misery, saps our vital forces and leads us toward dissolution, toward death. But precisely death is no longer evil to us, but the end of misery, redemption from all evil, the passage to the joyful resurrection of the flesh, to eternal blessed life. "Verily," though appearances, experience, feeling, speak against it, "verily, our sicknesses He hath borne, and our sorrows He hath charged."

"But we considered him stricken, smitten of God, and bowed down; yet he was pierced for our iniquities, crushed for our iniquities." V. 4b. 5a. The suffering of Christ is now described in the strongest terms. He was pierced, XXXX. They pierced, as David had already prophesied, his hands and feet. Ps. 22:17, He was crushed, XXXX. He was all worn up, his sap was dried up, he was like a broken piece, he had become a skeleton, his bones had broken asunder, you could count all his bones. Ps. 22, 15-18. We who now have the crucified before our eyes know exactly to what torture the Spirit of Christ here pointed. Christ died a violent death, and that death was criminal punishment. Thus we first thought him, and this is the impression which Christ's martyrdom makes on every natural man, an arch-villain, whom God's hand has now found and marked, whom God's vengeance has struck, XXXX one who is smitten and bowed down by God, while yet, as we have now perceived, he is pierced and crushed for the sake of our iniquities and transgressions. The sin of men is also now denoted by the strongest terms. XXX is breach of faith, apostasy, iniquity; XXX perversion of the law, transgression, iniquity, misdeed. We are all by nature, though not counted as such in the sight of men, yet in the sight of God, workers of iniquity, transgressors, criminals. He that is the servant of the Lord hath now received in our stead the reward of transgressors.

If Christ is martyred for our iniquities, if he has suffered what we have been guilty of in our iniquities, then he has suffered our punishment, the punishment we deserve. And so now the term punishment comes forth: XXX XXXXXX XXXX, "the punishment us to the
Peace was upon him," or more accurately translated, "our chastening of salvation upon him." V. 5b. XXXX in Hebrew, as Delitzsch has also pointed out, is the proper and only word for chastisement. Two thoughts are here combined into one short, concise expression. The first, next thought is this: our punishment, the

Punishment which we deserved was upon him; the other: that punishment which he suffered in our stead prospered us to peace, to salvation.

XXXX means peace, salvation, actually well-being, integrity. Christ has borne our punishment, and so we remain unharmed, spared with the punishment, so no punishment strikes us any more. Essentially the same thing is said by the following words: XXX-XXXX XXXXXXX, "and by his weal.
we were healed". Christ's entire torture is seen here as a great weal, a wound. And through his wounding it has now happened that we are healed from the blows we have received, that we have recovered from the punishment. The punishment, then, is upon him, our punishment, the punishment which we have deserved by our iniquities, to which we are already liable by our sinful conception and birth. The daily toil, plague, labor, sickness, pain of body and soul, all the woes of this life, and finally the woe of death-all this is not only the inevitable, natural consequence and effect of our sin, but punishment of sin, punishment in the proper, full sense of the word, punishment of God. God has pronounced upon man, because he has disobeyed His voice, transgressed His commandment, the sentence of punishment, that woman should bear children with pain, that man should feed with pain on the produce of the earth, that the ground should be accursed for his sake, that man should return to the dust from which he was taken. And in his whole life, in living and dying, sinful man experiences the execution of the divine penal essence. The misery, the wretchedness of this earth is not only evil, misfortune, adverse fortune, but punishment of sin. The joy of life, because man has turned away from the God of his life, is turned into sorrow and heartache. And death, and not only violent death, but death in its mildest form, is not only the natural end of life, but an act of violence, destruction of the life created by God. Man, because he will not live according to the will of his Creator, is not worthy to live. But the last, worst punishment of sin is eternal death and destruction. For sinful men, bodily death is only the passage to eternal death, to the torment and chastisement of hell. To forsake and offend the great, eternal God, avenges itself for all eternity. Yes, sin and punishment are indissolubly chained together. The just God cannot let sin go unpunished. Man who has sinned can never shift the punishment from himself, not even by his own repentance and satisfaction. Even the eternal punishment, the punishment in hell, is not an expiation of the punishment. But behold! now the great, incomprehensible God, the God of all grace, has done something new, great, unheard-of, before which the heathen and their kings, when they hear it, fall silent in adoration, 52:15, something which far exceeds our concepts of sin, punishment, righteousness, but which nevertheless shows the connection between

Sin and punishment not destroyed, divine justice not violated. He has opened the sanctuary to lost, condemned men: the punishment is upon him! Punishment, retributive justice, goes its way, takes its course. But there the faithful, innocent servant of the Lord, who deserved no punishment, has substituted himself, and has turned the punishment, the retributive justice, the avenging sword upon his own person. The punishment is upon him, our punishment, which we have deserved by our sins. It is a cruel misinterpretation and maltreatment of these simple words, if, as some recent commentators have done, they are interpreted to mean that what was upon Christ was only suffering, suffering which, when it was upon us, was punishment, but for Christ was mere martyrdom. No, what lies on Christ is punishment also for him, punishment which he also experienced, tasted, and felt as such, admittedly foreign punishment, the punishment of foreign sins. He has just appropriated what was foreign to him. Every glance at the great history of the Passion shows us the suffering, the torture of Christ as a punishment, as the punishment of God. The men who condemned Jesus and inflicted the criminal punishment upon Him only carried out God's counsel and will. God gave his consent to what the Jews and the Gentiles decided and then carried out against Jesus, delivered his servant into the hands of his enemies, abandoned him in the most severe suffering, withdrew all support and comfort from him, and turned away from him altogether. Since the wretched man cried out to him, he did not hear him. The Church sings and says to God, "Thou martyredst him on the trunk of the cross with nails and with spikes; thou slaughteredst him as a lamb, made his heart and veins to flow." The suffering Messiah gnaws, "Thou layest me in the dust of death." Ps. 22:16. And so Christ died the death of sinners, of transgressors, and also felt the sting of eternal death. To be forsaken of God, to be cast out, to be utterly divorced, that is hell's punishment. And that was sufficient punishment, that was satisfaction, a full substitute for the punishment we were guilty of, so also for eternal punishment. Eternal damnation - that is an inconceivable, terrible thought! But that the great, eternal God, the Creator of all things, before whom a thousand years are as a day, and a day as a thousand years, should taste even a little time the great woe of eternity - that is equally inconceivable, and would be a quite dreadful, intolerable thought, if there were not beside the XXXX the little word XXXXXX, if we did not know that this dreadful abyss is the abyss of eternal mercy. Yes, the punishment which serves for our. Peace, is upon him. Our punishment is upon him, and so no more punishment befalls us. We are healed, recovered, from the punishment into which we were born. The sorrow and woe of this life is no longer an oppressive, aching burden to us. The sting, the punishment has been taken out. Even if

If some of God's sending seems as if God were dealing with us according to our sins, as if he were punishing us according to our iniquities, as if he were visiting old sins upon us, it is a mere appearance; the feeling is deceptive. What feels like punishment is only a wholesome chastening of God. God no longer punishes us after Christ has borne our punishment. When a misstep we have made is visibly avenged, and bitter consequences follow, when we must confess that we have deserved punishment, we set before us that great word, "the punishment is upon him," which is more powerful than the punishment, and breathe a sigh of relief. Death has lost its sting for us. "Though it be called death and dying trouble, yet there is no dying at all, for JEsus is the death of death, and taketh away destruction." JEsus has taken away dying trouble and corruption. Hell can no longer terrify us. For all punishment is upon him. All who hold to Christ their Substitute have no more punishment to fear, either in this world or in the world to come. And such a life without fear and punishment is truly a happy existence. To be sure, this is and remains a wonderful thing: **Alius peccat, alius plectitur**, as Luther says. "How wonderful is this punishment: the good shepherd suffers for the sheep." **Hic autem diversum fit contra humanas et divinas leges, quae poenam vertunt in auctorem peccati, Christus enim propter nos punitur, id quod ratio numquam potest assequi**. We cannot understand this with our reason; it is contrary to all human and divine law, according to which punishment falls upon the author of sin, that Christ suffered for us, in our stead, for our sake. But he who rightly takes to heart this very "for us," the consolation of wrong-doers worthy of punishment, forgets all the scruples and difficulties which the idea of substitution causes to the thinking mind. G. St.

(To be continued.)

## Use of the expressions καλεῖν, *κλήβίζ, κλητός* in the New Testament.

(Conclusion.)

Significant for the right conception of when used of God is the passage Rom. 4, 17. There it is said of God: καλοϋντος ***τά μη όντα ώς όντα,*** "who calls the non-being as being."

(Cf. the detailed treatment of this passage in Stöckhardt's commentary.) Such an accusative as here the second, which denotes the consequence or effect, occurs more often in Greek and is to be translated "so that". God calls that which is not, so that it is. The call of God is an all-powerful word, a creative all-powerful word, where-

through the non-being into existence. The translation is essentially the same: God calls the non-existent as if it were - he treats it as if it were already there; for by his call it becomes precisely something that exists. Flacius: "**Dicitur Deus vocare ea, quae non sunt, tamquam si sint, aut, sicut si coram adessent: id est, solo verbo aut mandato posse res creare. Videtur apostolus alludere ad primam creationem, ubi Deus subito ac uno verbo res creat, ut compareant, et absolutissime sint; non aliter ac si quis subito evocaret ex aedibus aut proximo cubiculo servos ibi paratos et mandata domini expectantes, cum illae res nusquam in rerum natura reperirentur**." Yes, God's calling is something different from man's calling. We must not forget that. And though the present passage does not speak specifically of God's calling through the Gospel, yet this saying throws a bright light on such passages where it does. (See also what was said about Matt. 9, 13 and Apost. 2, 39).

Rom. 8, 28-30. "But we know that to them that love God all things are for the best, who are appointed according to the purpose, τοῖς **κατά *πρόθ εσιν κλητοῖς ούσιν***. For whom he hath before ordained to be like unto the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. But whom he hath ordained, them hath he also called," οὓς ***δε προ- ώριϋε, τούτους και εκάλεσε' καί οὓς εκάλεσε***. Those who love God are the Christians, the children of God. To them all things must be for the best, even sufferings. This is the comfort which the apostle holds out to Christians. How do we know this? The reason evidently lies in the appositional phrase: **τοῖς *κατά πρόθ εσιν κλητοῖς ούσιν*** = because they are after
are called to a purpose. So they coincide with those who love God. It is here meant by this word only of those successfully called. And they are κατά ***πρόθ εσιν κλητοί,*** their calling, by which
they were converted, is the execution of a purpose. So the κλητοί here are those brought to Christ, to faith, on account of the divine purpose through the Gospel. In the detailed reasoning of the first clause, which now follows, the verb καλεῖν is in the same manner as used. It is beyond our present design to enter at length into the exegesis of the several expressions. It is sufficient for our purpose to point out that the last links of the chain clearly show that in the after clause, τούτους ***καί εκάλεσε,*** and in the following antecedent clause, οὓς ***εκάλεσε,*** the verbum καλεῖν is restricted to those who will be blessed. For only of such can the justifying and glorifying apply. So in this whole connection calling is used only of successful calling.

Rom. 9, 12. The second example that St. Paul uses in this chapter to show how everything depends on God's grace is that of Jacob and Esau. And there it is said: "Before the children were born and

had done neither good nor evil, that the purpose of God might be according to election, it was said to her [Rebekah], not by merit of works, but by grace of the Caller, **ονκ *ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τον καλονντος:*** The greater shall become servant to the lesser." By the latter phrase, ονκ *ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' κτλ*., the preceding statement is evidently again taken up and emphasized. As to the words μηδ*'ε πραξάντων τι ἀγαόόν η κακόν* correspond the words ονκ *ἐξ ἔργων,* so.
corresponds to the final clause *ἵνα ή κατ' εκλογήν πρόϋεσις τον ϋ-εον μένη* the *ἀλλ' ἐκ τον καλονντος.* Call and choose are thus here used **promiscuously.** Not as if the terms were the same. The election precedes the calling; the calling is the execution of the election. But for this very reason the one may alternate with the other. So the same thought is here as in ch. 8, 28-30.

Rom. 9, 23. Here the purpose of God and the calling are more clearly placed next to each other. God "hath borne with great patience the vessels of wrath, which are ripe unto condemnation, that he might make known the riches of his glory in the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared for glory, whom he hath called, even us," ***a προητοίμασεν εις δόξαν, ονς και έκάλεσεν ή μας. '"Ημάς*** is
Supplement to ονς. From the general the apostle passes to the particular. The vessels of mercy, which God prepared beforehand, he also called, and so also us. As Rom. 8, 30, so also here calling follows predestination. The calling is meant to be the execution of the eternal divine counsel. The meaning can be no other than this: Whom God hath chosen in eternity, He hath then converted in time by His call. In the following quotation from Hosea, καλεῖν is used twice more, not in the sense of calling, but only of those who are or are to become God's people.

Rom. 11, 29. Here the noun κλησις is found for the first time**. *Ἀμεταμέλητα γάρ τα χαρίσματα και ή κλησις τον -& εον***. The verbal adjective ***ἀμεταμέλητος*** may be taken either passively or as denoting impossibility; both give good sense. So either unrepentant = will not be repented of, or unrepentant = cannot be repented of. There is a rationale in the sentence: For God's gifts and calling are unrepentant or incalculable. In the previous one the apostle had explained that all Israel, that is, the true Israel after election, will be blessed according to the promise, even if it does not seem so at the moment. Thus, according to the gospel, which they do not now believe, he holds the Israelites to be enemies, but according to election, because they are elect, he loves them. And why? Because the very election of God is unchangeable. But he does not now again put ***ἐκλογή*** in the justifying clause, but χαρίσματα ***και κλησις.*** These terms
are thus interrelated to the apostle. We make the same perception here that we have already encountered many times: calling

is used for election. They stand to each other in the relation of effect and cause. The successful profession is also meant here.

1 Cor. 1, 9. ***Πιστός ό & εός, δι ον έκλήϋητε εις κοινωνίαν τον νίον αυτόν Ίησον Χρίστον τον κνρίον ημών.*** "Faithful is God, by whom
ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son JEsu Christ our Lord." The apostle thanks God v. 4 for the grace given to the Corinthians in Christ Jesus. He states that God has done all things for them so far; only the revelation of JEsu Christ, His Second Coming, is yet to come. He then assures them of the grace of constancy, that God will also keep them until the end. So the final sentence is justifying, even if no justifying particle is set. God, who is faithful, by whom ye were called, He also will do all other things. It is the same thought as e.g. Phil. 1, 6: "He that began the good work in you, the same will accomplish it until the day of JESUS CHRIST." Let us here immediately add 1 Thess. 5, 24: ***Πιστός'δ καλών νμάς, δς και ποιήσει,*** "faithful is he that
call you, who also will do it". The present tense in this passage emphasizes the lasting. He who works on you by his call, who has brought you to faith and keeps you in faith, will keep you blameless for the future of our Lord Jesus Christ. First we call attention to the fact that in these sayings only those are meant who have been converted by the call of God, who stand in the faith. Then, for the sake of God's faithfulness, constancy, the preservation in the faith, is established with the calling. In their calling to the community of Jesus Christ, in the fact that God has begun His work in them and made them His children, Christians should see a pledge for the continuation of God's blessings for their eternal salvation. Bengel: "**Vocatio pignus ceterorum beneficiorum**." Underlying this is the same thought as in the Epistle to the Romans in the passages cited.

1 Cor. 1:23-26. "But we preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a vexation, to the Greeks foolishness, but to those who are called, αντοΐς ***δε τοΐς κλητοϊς,*** both Jews and Greeks, we preach Christ divine power and divine wisdom. . . . Behold, brethren, your profession, **βλέπετε** *γάρ την κλήσιν νμών.* Not much wise according to the flesh, not much mighty, not much noble (are called)." In this connection "the called themselves" are just contrasted with those who also hear the word Well, but to whom it is a vexation or folly, who therefore do not accept it. ***Κλήσις,*** v. 26, is **abstractum pro concreto** = you called; those who are called; there are not many wise among them, etc. This verse is closely connected with the preceding statement; it is reason for it, as the γάρ indicates. Yea, emphasizes the apostle, the gospel of Christ crucified is divine power and divine

Wisdom. Do not let this be disputed, that it is an offense to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks. For what men count foolishness in God is greater wisdom than all the wisdom of men, and what men count weakness in God is greater power than all the power of men. For look only at those whom God has called; they are generally the least before the world. And what hath God made of them by his gospel! - The called, then, are here also those who are won by the call, the converted, the Christians. And for occurs then again in the following verses a ***ἐκλέγεσϋαι.*** Were it thus to be explained: What is foolish in the sight of the world, God hath chosen to call it, this would amount to the same thing in substance. Those of whom ***ἐκλέγεσϋαι*** is said, coincide in number with those and those signified by, as the words are here used. Nor can what is here said of divine power and divine wisdom, according to the context, be so narrowly conceived as if by it were signified mere capacity for acceptance. The called, the elect, are those to whom Christ ***ἐγενήϋ-η σοφία από ϋεοΰ, δικαιοσύνη τε και αγιασμός και άπολύτρωσις, ϊνα κα& ώς γέγραπταΓ 'Ο καυχώμενος εν κυρίφ καυχάσϋω.***

1 Cor. 7, 15-24. In this passage it occurs nine times, and κλήσις once. ***Κλήσις*** here denotes the state, condition, earthly relation, in which one was when the divine call met him. In peace God has called us, that is, we are called that we may have peace, rest. And now the exhortation is that every one may remain quiet in the state, in the position, in which he was when he was called. It is immaterial to the Christian state whether one is a circumcised or an uncircumcised man, a slave or a free man. As to the latter, it is certainly better to be a free man than a slave, but this has no influence on one's standing with God. - Now in the whole context we are speaking only of converts, of Christians. And these are here designated, as in the former passages, as those who have been called or are called. As καλεῖν was a technical term among the Greeks for summons to judgment, so in New Testament Greek the word becomes a technical term for convert.

Gal. 1, 6. ***Θαυμάζω οτι ούτω ταχέως μετα.τίϋεσ'&ε από του καλέσαντος υμάς έν χάριτι Χρίστου εις έτερον ευαγγελίαν.*** "I marvel that ye are so soon turned away from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto another gospel." The Epistle to the Galatians is addressed to the churches in Galatia, v. 2. The people, therefore, about whom the apostle marvels that they have allowed themselves to be turned away, are members of these churches, not just any people, but Christians. Only of such could a turning away be feared. Others are not yet turned to God. When, therefore, God is called ***ό καλέσας υμάς έν χάριτι Χριστού,*** καλεῖν may be here

not merely to invite, nor merely to invite and give strength to accept. Nay, by this word the apostle here signifies, in his usual manner, the divine work of conversion. ***Ἐν χάριτι Χρίστον*** is adverbial clause to καλέσαντος, and indicates the manner or means. God hath made you Galatians his children in the grace of Christ, by the grace of Christ, that is, through the gospel of free grace in Christ; what more want ye? How can ye turn away from him that hath done this unto you unto another "gospel"?

Gal. 1, 15. "But since it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace - δ ***ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μον και καλέσας διά τής χάριτος αντον - to*** reveal his Son in me," etc. Here again καλεῖν is used of the calling to a certain function, to the apostleship. And it is likewise of a particular person, of Paul. God set him apart and called him from his mother's womb. What happened on the way to Damascus, and immediately therefrom, was the execution of what had already been decided concerning him before - the same use of καλεῖν which we have now so often observed.

Gal. 5:8. ***Ἡ πεισμονή ονκ εκ τον καλονντος νμας.*** "The persuasion - this attempt to persuade - is not of him who calls you." What is meant is the attempt to force upon the Galatian Christians the necessity of circumcision. The Galatians had no idea of the import of this demand. The apostle testifies to them that whoever is circumcised is guilty of keeping the whole law. It is nothing less than an apostasy from grace to be saved by the law. - Since those designated by the pronoun are such as he has just testified ran fine, and whom he soon after addresses again as dear brethren, the καλεῖν is also in this connection used only of successful calling. The present tense stands to denote duration. ***Ὁ* καλών *νμας'*** is he that worketh in you by his powerful call, who hath made you his children by the gospel, and is yet continually working in you. In the calling through the gospel of free grace in Christ lies also all other things that belong to Christianity, so, even this, that you be not confounded by anything that wants to draw hon of grace to works. A little leaven spoils the whole dough. A little false doctrine may spoil all that we have by divine reputation. Bengel: "**Vocatio norma totius cursus**."

Gal. 5, 13. ***'Υμείς γάρ επ' ελεν& ερία εκλήφητε, αδελφοί.*** "For ye were called unto liberty" (purpose) "brethren." This clause still belongs to the connection just treated of, and the apostle now passes on to the exhortation to make the liberty to which Christians have been

have been called, which they have received by their profession, by their conversion, not to abuse them. It needs no further elaboration to see that here also is the narrower use of the καλεῖν.

Eph. 1, 18. The apostle prays for the believing Ephesians, that they may know more and more the glory of their Christian state, and there it is first said: **εις *τό ειδέναι υμάς τις έστιν η ελπίς της κλήσεως αυτόν,*** "that ye may know what is the hope of his profession." ***Αύτοῦ*** is subjective genitive. His, that is, God's, calling is the calling which proceeds from God. When Luther translates "of your profession," it amounts to the same thing in substance. It is only a different point of view. There Beruf is passive, and the pronoun is in the objective sense. The profession which proceeds from God is that which we experience. ***Τής κλήσεως*** is **gen. subj.** = the hope which the calling of God has, entails, which is the point of God's calling - which is the hope to which God has called you. The apostle's intercession, then, is that the Christians at Ephesus may receive enlightened eyes to see what a blessed hope it is to which they have been called, what awaits them as called. This κλήσις of God is not a mere invitation, nor a mere bestowal of power to accept; for in the following verses it is plainly stated, that we believe according to the effect of his mighty strength, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead. Since we were dead in sins, he made us alive together with Christ.

Eph. 4, 1. 4. ***Παρακαλώ ουν υμάς εγώ*** **ό δέσμιος *εν κυρίτρ, αξίως περιπατήσαι τής κλήσεως, ής εκλή&ητε.*** "I bound in the Lord exhort you to walk worthily of the profession by which ye are called." is attraction of the relative for the **dat. instr.** Christians are to walk as befits the profession (active) by which they have been called, which they have experienced. This exhortation, which is then detailed, and which, in short, amounts to peace and concord, vv. 4-6, with the words, "One body and one spirit, as ye also are called unto one hope of your profession- κα-^ώς ***και έκλήϋ-ητε εν μια έλπίδι τής κλήσεως υμών.*** One Lord, one faith," etc. All Christians form one body, in which the same one Spirit dwells, just as then they have been called in one hope of their profession. Being called has for its end the same one hope. Again, it is clear, xa^ and κλήσις are confined in their use to those successfully called, to converts. Try to insert for these expressions invite, or give power to accept, and you will find it cannot be done. It is not a question of those who are merely invited, nor merely of those to whom, say, the faculty of acceptance has been conferred, in the case of whom, therefore, it would still be necessary to wait and see how the matter would turn out.

is running. Such also could not yet be exhorted to sanctification of life. ***Καλεῖν*** **and κλήσις** find their adequate expression in "convert," "conversion," "Christian state." Walk worthy of your conversion which ye have experienced, even as ye have been converted feid with one hope of your conversion, your Christian state.

Phil. 3:14. . . . ***κατά σκοπόν διώκω επί τό βραβεῖον τής άνω κλήσεως τον -&εον έν Χριστφ 'Ιησού.*** "According to the goal"-the eye fixed on the goal-"I chase after the battle prize of the upper (heavenly) calling in Christ JEsu." The image is taken from the race in the racecourse. ***Κλήσεως*** **is Gen. subj.** Luther aptly renders the thought by the phrase: "I chase after the jewel which holds forth the heavenly calling in Christo JEsu." Paul knows that he is not yet perfect in his Christian walk, but as a runner in the racecourse looks steadfastly to the goal in order to win the prize, so he too, as a Christian, has the goal always in view, looks neither to the right nor to the left, and strives after the jewel of perfection. Of this he says that the heavenly calling in Christ holds it forth. God's call in Christ is aimed at this perfection. When God calls a man through the gospel, the goal is that he may one day be renewed in the image of the one who created him. But the apostle does not speak here in general terms, but of a particular, concrete case; he speaks of himself. The thought of our passage may be briefly stated thus: I earnestly strive to attain the end to which God has called me, converted me.

Col. 3, 15, ***Καί ή εΙρήνη τον ίίεού βραβενέτω έν ταΐς καρδίαις υμών, εις ήν και έκλή'&ητε έν ένί σώματΓ καί ευχάριστοι γίνεστε.*** " And let the peace of God reign in your hearts, to which also ye were called feid in one body: and be ye thankful." What has been said concerning 1 Cor. 7:15-24 and other passages applies here also.

1 Thess. 2:12. . . . ***εις τό περιπατήσαι υμάς άξίως τον Ίλεον τον κα- λονννντος υμάς εις την εαυτόν βασιλείαν και δόξαν. . . .*** "That ye walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory".

1 Thess. 4, 7. ***Ού γάρ έκάλεσεν ημάς ό ϋεός επί ακαθαρσία. άλλ' έν άγιασμω.*** "For God hath not called us to uncleanness, but to sanctification." According to what has been said concerning similar passages, e.g. Eph. 4:1, these statements need no further treatment.

1 Thess. 2, 13. The apostle sets forth why he owes God thanks for the Thessalonians: ***ου εΐλατο υμάς ό ϋεός απ' αρχής εις σωτηρίαν έν άγιασμφ πνεύματος καί πίστει άλη&. είας, εις ο έκάλεσεν υμάς διά τον ευαγ γελίου ημών, εις περιποίησιν δόξης τον κυρίου ημών Ίησοϋ Χρίστον*** - "that God hath chosen you from the beginning unto blessedness in sanctification of the Spirit, and in the faith of the truth" (the prepositional phrase is adverbial to εϊλατο and indicates the closer determination = such that.

the Holy Spirit sanctify you, and ye believe the truth), "whereunto he hath called you by our gospel unto the possession of the glory of our Lord JEsu Christ." The train of thought is this: We have every cause to thank God for you, points God has chosen you to blessedness from the beginning, not absolutely, but in such a way that He has at the same time determined how your blessedness is to come about, namely, by your experiencing the sanctification of the Spirit, and thus believing the truth. To which end God hath called you (in time) by our gospel, so that ye now possess what ye were elected unto, the glory of our Lord JEsu Christ. Taking περιποίησή here passively, it follows that you are now actually possessed, the property of the glory of our Lord JEsu Christ. ***Καλεῖν*** is here used in the same way as Rom. 8, 28-30. No other view is acceptable.

1 Tim. 6, 12. "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, to which also thou art called, **εἰς *ήν και ἐκλήῦης,*** and.
confessed have a good confession before many witnesses." The medium επιλαβοῦ**,** which Luther translates "lay hold of," is stronger than the active - lay hold of something, lay hold of something. And as the exhortation is addressed to a Christian, it supposes possession - lay hold of eternal life, to which you have also been called. Thus justice is done to it only when it is understood of the successful profession. Hold fast the eternal life that has already been granted to you by your calling!

2 Tim. 1, 9. ... ***τοῦ σώσαντος ήμας καί καλέσαντος κλήσει αγία*** --. "who has made us blessed and called us with a holy calling". Who is meant by "us"? the people in general? That cannot be. For, first, the apostle does not speak of men in general, but of Timothy and himself. Secondly, here is an exhortation not to be ashamed of the testimony of the Lord, nor of the bound apostle, for the sake of tribulations, but to sympathize according to the power of God, by the power of God. And God is now further described as the one who has made us blessed, etc. The participles are thus justifying: suffer with; for consider what great, glorious things God has done for us! So Christians are spoken of. So also **σώζειν** cannot be generally meant of the acquisition of blessedness through Christ, but it denotes the appropriation of redemption. In this connection, and cannot be understood otherwise than of the successful call. The expressions conduct themselves to the **σώζειν** as the part to the whole. At the same time in and lies the indication of the manner for the **σώζειν.** God has made us blessed,
For he hath called us by his holy calling into his adoption. In the following, as in other passages, all this is traced back to God's purpose and grace.

We see, in these Pauline epistles, only the narrower use of **καλεῖν, *κλήσις,*** and **κλητός is** found**.**

1 Pet. 1:15. ... ***ἀλλα κατά τον καλέσαντα υμάς άγιον και αυτοί άγιοι έν πάοη αναστροφή γενή***-άητε, "but according to the Holy One who called you, you also be holy in all your walk." The apostle is here speaking to Christians, as the whole context shows; he designates them in the entrance as **εκλεκτοί,** These he exhorts to be holy, as he who has called them, is holy. ***Καλεῖν,*** therefore, is evidently not in a general sense, but is limited to certain persons, to those who have become believers. The exhortation can only be, Be ye holy, as he is holy who hath made you his children by his strong call.

The same use is before ch. 2, 9: "Ye are the chosen generation," etc. Luther (IX, 1186): "The virtue (says St. Peter), that is, the marvelous work which God proves in you, that He has brought you from darkness to His marvelous light, you shall preach."

It is the same with the passages 2:21 and 3:9: to this end were ye called, that is, to suffer; ye were made the children of God. That you should suffer was part of the purpose when God converted you through his gospel. - And so in the second place, God's purpose in converting you by his call was that you should inherit blessings; therefore you also should bless. Luther says to 1 Pet. 2:21 (XII, 544), "And first he draws to their calling to remind them why and for what purpose they became Christians."

Concerning 1 Petr. 5, 10 we refer to what has been said above in the treatment of 1 Cor. 1, 9 and 1 Thess. 5, 24.

2 Pet. 1, 3. 10. ***Ὡς πάντα ημῖν της θείας δννάμεως αυτόν τά προς ζωήν και ευσέβειαν δεδωρημένης διά της έπιγνώσεως τον καλέσαντος ημάς διά δόξης καί άρετης.*** To this antecedent, introduced with a causal **gen. absol. does** not come the postfix until v. 5. Taking **δεδωρημένης** as passive, the first words would be translated thus, "since his divine power is bestowed upon us in respect of all (namely, in respect of) that which pertains to life and godliness (belonging)." Actively rendered, it is, "since his divine power has given us all things (viz.) pertaining to life and godliness (belonging)." As to the sense, the same thing finally comes out in both cases = since we Christians are enabled to all things, namely, concerning life and godliness. Now follows the indication whereby this was done, "through the knowledge of Him that hath called us by glory and virtue." Is τοϋ ***καλέσαντος*** subjective or objective genitive? Do the words mean, by the knowledge which proceedeth from him that called us . . . by this, that God, who hath called us . . . called, knew (us)-or do they mean: through (our) knowledge of him who called us . . . called = by the fact that we recognized God who called us? Since the divine power is spoken of, which is given to us in regard to all that belongs to the Christian life, or which has given all this to us,

so with the ***ἐπίγνωσις at*** any rate nothing can be thought of that would be in us, out of us. If we take **τον *καλέσαντος* as gen. obj.** then ***ἐπίγνωσις*** must after all be precisely the knowledge wrought in us by God. But we will not enter further into this question here, but will see how it stands with καλεῖν, whether one holds the one or the other view. There then the addition **διά *δόξης καί αρετής is*** to be noted. This evidently resumes the εία ***δύναμις αύτο***ῦ, v. 3, which is also evident from v. 4, where it is said that through these, namely, δόξα ***καί αρετή,*** the dearest and very greatest promises are bestowed upon us, namely, that through the same we become partakers of the divine nature. ***Δόξα καί αρετή*** is nothing but the glorious power of God. And by it now God has called us. So then καλεῖν cannot be used in the general sense of an invitation. The call of God is here rather **expressis verbis** designated as a powerful one. And that this powerful call of God is not here thought otherwise than successful, lies also in the fact that it is spoken to Christians. God hath called us by his glory and virtue, is nothing else than: God has converted us by his glorious, powerful call in the gospel, made us his children, partakers of the divine nature, and thus we are enabled to do all that pertains to the Christian life. Now it may be interpreted thus: by our recognizing (in God's power) Him, we came to believe in Him who drew us (just now) by His powerful call; or thus: by God's recognizing (as His own) Him who drew us by His powerful call. For καλεῖν, in both cases, the meaning as a vigorous, successful calling is secured by the context and the particular nearer determination. On the exposition of the glorious Christian state with its power, the Apostle next bases the exhortation to diligence in Christian walk. In this connection it is then said v. 10: **Διό *μάλλον, αδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν υμών τήν κλήσιν καί έκλογήν ποιεῖσ& αΓ ταῦτα γάρ ποιοῦντες ου μή πταίσητέ ποτέ.*** "Therefore, brethren, be more diligent to make your profession and election firm, for doing this you will never stumble again." Profession and election are something done, not something future. Therefore, making fast cannot refer to profession and election per se. For something that is done is done; it cannot in itself be fixed or made to waver; it stands as it is. But another thing is, how far the fact is known to men. When, therefore, the apostle exhorts, "Be diligent to make your profession and election sure," this can only mean "for yourselves," = to become sure of your profession and election. And for this reason alone, because v. 3 speaks of effective, successful profession, we have to think of the same here also with κλήσις. What else could it mean? Are Christians to become certain that they have been invited by God? Or are they to be certain of this

that in this invitation was also given the power to accept? No, more than that. Christians are to be assured that God's call to them has not been in vain, that they are truly converted, truly Christians, children of God through the gospel, and thus chosen. Profession is here placed before election **secundum nos**. Going back from our point of view, calling is the first thing we are to be sure of, and from calling then election.

The use of καλεῖν and κλήσις is thus the same in Peter as in the Pauline epistles previously treated of.

Heb. 3, 1. Christians are here addressed as **αδελφοί *άγιοι, κλήσεως επονρανίον μέτοχοι,*** comrades, partakers of the heavenly calling, yet Christians are not only so far as the heavenly call has gone out to them, but so far as they have experienced its effect; they have been drawn to God by the heavenly call.

Heb. 5, 4. "No man taketh glory to himself, but he also that is called of God, **ό καλούμενος *νπδ τον -& εον,*** even as Aaron." Compare what is said to Apost. 13:2; 16:10; Rom. 1:1, concerning the calling to an office.

Heb. 9:15. "And therefore is he also a mediator of the new testament, that by the death which was wrought for redemption from the transgressions which were under the first testament, they which are called **οί *κεκλημένοι might*** receive the promised eternal inheritance." By the **κεκλημένοι** here cannot be generally meant those who are invited. For it is not a question of those to whom the eternal inheritance is prepared - which, by the way, are all men - but of those who actually receive the heavenly inheritance, and these are those in whom the divine call has its success. Lucher (XII, 466): ". . . whom (the Spirit) not all have received, but those who have been called to be heirs forever, that is, the elect.

Heb. 11, 8. ***Πίοτει καλούμενος Αβραάμ νπήκοναεν έζελ'&εϊν.*** "By faith Abraham obeyed, being called to go forth." There is no special mention here of being called into the kingdom of God, but the matter is connected with it. Evidently it is a question here of successful calling, for success is, after all, specially attested. But for the very reason that success is specially mentioned, it does not lie in and of itself denoted in **καλούμενος.** Whether the call to Abraham was such as at the same time effected the acceptance, could not be decided from this passage alone. But since Scripture unanimously testifies that faith is God's work in us, God's work wrought by the gospel, ***ύπακούειν*** **and καλεϊσ&** ***αι*** stand to each other in the relation of effect and cause. Abraham was called to go forth, and in virtue of this call he went forth.

Revelation 17:14. "These shall contend with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is the HCrr of lords, and the King of kings; and with him the called, and the chosen, and the faithful."- καί ***οί μετ' αντον κλητοί εκλεκτοί καί πιστοί.*** In this compilation of those who will contend with the Lamb against the enemies and conquer them, there can be no doubt as to who the κλητοί are. The three expressions **κλητο*ί, εκλεκτοί, πιστοί cannot be*** taken as complementary to each other in the sense: those among all the called who are just chosen, and, still more precisely, who are faithful. To this, besides others, would already be opposed the μετ' ***αντον.*** "Those called with him" excludes all who are just not with the Lamb. By the three expressions the same persons are designated, namely, those on the side of the Lamb opposed to the enemies; they are only designated according to different points of view. They are his called and chosen and faithful.

Ostenb. 19, 9. ***Μακάριοι οί εις τό δεΐπνον τον γάμον τον άρνίον κεκλη- μένοι.*** "Blessed are they which are called unto the supper of the Lamb!" ***Οί κεκλημένοι*** here are evidently not the same as those who are designated by the same expression in the parable of the royal wedding, Matt. 22, namely, those who had received an invitation, but refused it. Of those who are called, blessedness is here spoken. So those who will be blessed are the elect. Those who in the previous place were designated by **κλητο*ί, εκλεκτοί, πιστοί,*** are here designated by the one word **οί *κεκλημένοι***. -

What, then, is the general result of our inquiry? Concerning the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, the summary has already been given elsewhere. With regard to the other Scriptures it is the case that καλεϊν***, κλήσις, κλητός*** occur exclusively in the narrower use of successful calling to designate Christians, the elect, the blessed.

It should be noted here the treatment of the words in question by the following commentators: Wilke-Grimm translate **invitare, invitatus, invitatio**. The execution of the individual passages, however, clearly shows that a mere invitation is not meant, and concerning the epistles it is said: "**Ceterum in epistolis N. T. numquam non eos tantum Deus vocasse dicitur, qui divinae voci in evangelio factae obediverunt, igitur qui Christo nomen dederunt [cf. Rom. 8, 30 . . . coll. 1 Cor. 1, 24] ; qui invitationem aspernati sunt, in vocatorum numero non habentur." (Clavis N. T. Ph. Editio IV. rec.**)

Cremer, indeed, conceives election as one that can be nullified, but to call is = "to call someone to a certain purpose (hence synon. to choose), to call that he may hear, come, and do what is incumbent upon him, or that he may become what is intended for him." "Calling is always effectual, though not always with the same result, 2 Cor. 1:15, 16. The only thing that is correct is that as called, only.

the members of the congregation of God appear . . . not those who have refused all participation in the word-not because they are not called, but because they are not eligible." "Which is the first act in the realization of the divine election . . . in its objects." (Bibl.-theol. Wörterb. d. neutest. Gräzität.)

Flacius renders **vocare in the** specifically Christian sense with **accersere (= arcessere)**. Thus he says to Rom. 8, 30: ". . . ubi **vocare significat, verbo ac religionis doctrina ad Deum et veram pietatem, accersere et convertere**". On 1 Cor. 7, 20: ". . . . **id est, in eo vitae genere permaneat, in quo ad Christum conversus est**". Generally: "**Vocari vero, adjunctum verbum, significat conversionem seu adhibitionem ad spiritualem, Deoque acceptam vitam, pietatemque. "** (Clavis.)**

Luther does not specifically go into proving the meaning of the expressions, but Beruf is to him in the passages in question nothing other than successful profession. To the already mentioned sayings we add the following. On Matt. 9: "And indeed he so calls him (Matthew), that he not only justifies him through the forgiveness of sins, but also makes him an apostle." (VII, 53.) "Therefore, when sinners are called to repentance, it is so that, although their sins are forgiven them, yet they are called to a perpetual effort to acknowledge, to apologize, to put to death, to bury sins." (VII, 61.) On 1 Cor. 1, 9: "Which Christ hath begun in you, and hath already given, he will surely keep you well unto the end and for ever, if only ye yourselves through unbelief will not fall from it, or cast it from you: for his word or promise which is given unto you, and his work which he worketh in you, is not changeable as the word and work of men, but is fixed, certain, and divine, immovable truth. Since therefore ye have such a divine calling, let ye comfort yourselves of it, and firmly rely upon it." (XII, 911.) On Eph. 4, 1 f.: "This ought to be the chief and noblest thing, according to which a Christian ought to direct his useless walk in the world, that he remember and consider himself for what he is called and set by God, that is, why he is called a Christian, and so live after the same. . . . St. Paul also says, "Ye have received the word and grace of God, and are now blessed, having in Christ all things that ye need: remember ye yourselves therefore, and consider that ye are called unto other and higher things than other men, and so live." (XII, 890.)

Stöckhardt, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (pp. 36. 389 ff.), deals with the question in detail, taking into account older and newer exegetes. There it says: "The expressions

In the Pauline epistles, where the general Christian vocation is spoken of, always designate a call which is not only vigorous

and effectual, but also includes success in itself." "God, who desires that all men should be saved, and who has prepared salvation for all through Christ, calls to Christ by the preaching of the gospel all who hear this preaching. He sends forth his servants, the preachers of the gospel, and they invite all whom they can only reach with their voice to partake of the great supper, of the marriage supper, of salvation in Christ. Thus all men to whom the Gospel has come to their ears are in the sense of **invitati**. And so the Lord Matth. 20, 16, and 22, 14, uses the expression κλητο*ί.* Most men, alas, reject this call, this summons of God, and become disobedient to the gospel. But those who have obeyed the call of God, who have received the gospel in faith, have not done so of themselves. God has worked faith in them. God, through the preaching of the gospel, in which he offered them salvation, also called them inwardly, grasped their hearts, their wills, gave them the word of consent in their hearts, called them, drew them, brought them to Christ. 'With effectual κλήσις the gospel passed through their hearts.' (Lange.) Thus they are κλητοί in the concise.
sense of the word, not only as **invitati,** but, as Usteri and Rückert express it, as **arcessiti, as** those who are brought here by the call of God."..  .m....

## Miscellany.

Concerning **the doctrine of predestination of Luther and Calvin,** P. H. Borgschüttmann writes in the "A. E. L. K." (Sp. 702 f.): "To be sure, Luther likewise at first, in his writing **De servo arbitrio,** directed against Erasmus, abruptly advocated the doctrine of predestination, and though he did not expressly retract it, yet later he allowed it to recede and become ineffective for his world of thought, and still more Lutheranism, without abrogating the evangelical right of this doctrine for salvation. For Luther, too, the idea of predestination was only an auxiliary idea for the emphasis on the natural man's bondage to salvation and the sole efficacy of God's grace in conversion. In any case, the basic Lutheran idea of God's will of grace revealed in Christ toward all men, which corresponds to the New Testament conception of God as a will of love and a heavenly Father, has not been impaired by this as it was in Calvin. Even as a predestinarian, Luther nevertheless emphasizes: Christ bore all sins; if all believed, all - not only the predestinated - would be saved. Calvin, on the other hand, took up the "pre-Reformation" Augustinian idea of predestination in full force and added it to his medieval-tinged be-

Calvin's conception of God as the almighty will pushed him to the extreme and had an ever greater influence on his world of thought. Admittedly, such outstanding representatives of Protestant science as A. Ritschl have zealously asserted that the idea of predestination in Calvin was only an "appendage" added to the doctrine of redemption for the sake of Paul's authority, an "accidental insertion," and after this influential Lutheran theologian, who was friendly to Calvin, many Reformed theologians have asserted the same thing, such as Öhninger, for example, without, of course, mentioning Ritschl, with whose thoughts he operates. But this view is untenable. In his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, namely in the explanation of chapter 9, Calvin says that "before men come into the world, each one is allotted his lot by God, eternal blessedness to the one, eternal damnation to the other, for no other reason than his hidden will, his exclusive discretion (**arcano suo arbitrio, mero suo beneplacito**). In the **Institutio religionis Christianae** III, 21. 5 (1559) it says: 'Predestination we call the counsel of God, according to which he has determined in himself what should become of every man according to his fine will. For not under the same condition are all created, but rather to some eternal life, and to others eternal damnation, is decreed beforehand." (**Praedestinationem vocamus Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes, sed aliis vita aeterna, aliis damnatio aeterna praeordinatur**.) All contradictions of human and Christian consciousness against this doctrine are put down by Calvin with the 'It is written'; for him the Bible is the divinely inspired law-book in every word, which must be followed to the letter. The person of Christ as a historical fact and all his saving work is subordinate to the eternal good pleasure of God. The merit (**meritum**) and satisfaction (**satisfactio**) of Christ are regarded as consequences of God's electing counsel. -Christ could only merit from God's good pleasure.' Christ's merit and efficacy in salvation are referred from the outset only to the elect. Christ is efficacious as the subject of satisfaction and merit only in that he is set as the head and surety of the elect, as **caput et sponsor electorum,** and hereunto directs his purpose. According to Calvin's explanation of John 15:13, God could have worked salvation in another way, as Duns Scotus had already asserted. God could well have redeemed us by his word and by the will of his will, if not for our sake another way had been chosen. (**Poterat nos Deus verbo aut nutu redimere, nisi aliter nostra causa visum fuisset**.) According to Schneckenburger and Schweizer, therefore, the satisfaction of Christ is to be presented in Calvin and the Calvinists not as **causa meritoria,** but as **causa instrumentalis.**

put it. Outstanding Reformed theologians, such as Schneckenburger, A. Schweizer, and others, have therefore declared the doctrine of predestination to be the actual central doctrine of Calvin and Calvinism, as have Catholic theologians, e.g. Mähler, Linsemann, Kifl, and others, and no less also Lutheran theologians, e.g. Luthardt, Thomasius, Lechler, Plitt, Kahnis, etc. While this may perhaps be too much to assert, the doctrine of twofold predestination is nevertheless an exceedingly important doctrine, strongly and ever more strongly influencing Calvin's thought and inhibiting the efficacy of the idea of justification (Seeberg, J. Kaftan)." Had Calvin really stuck to the "It is written," he would no more have come up with the doctrine of predestination to damnation and the denial of common grace, etc., than Luther did. Luther stuck to the Bible without bothering with rhyme. Calvin, on the other hand, constructed his own doctrine and corrected the Scriptures according to a preconceived, false idea. Whoever therefore calls Luther's doctrine Calvinism, betrays only that he does not know Luther's or Calvin's doctrine of predestination, and that he has not yet arrived at clarity in the principle of theology. F. B.

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1st Synodical Report of the Middle District, with a paper on "Justification according to Rom. 3:21-4:8." (12 Cts.) - 2nd Synodical Report of the California and Nevada District, with instructive and edifying proceedings on the subject, "I Believe an Everlasting Life." (12 Cts.) - 3. "Be Thou My Guide! " A Handbook of Advice and Comfort for Young Lutherans Newly Confirmed. (20 Cts.; in gilt 25 Cts.) We have already referred to this excellent little book by Father Herzberger in the previous number of "Lehre und Wehre." But we would like to draw the attention of our pastors to it once again. It will also be a great blessing in the hands of those who have been confirmed for some time, and especially of all parents. Of Grosse's "Doctrines of Discernment" the other day even the *Standard* said, "It is great value for the price." The same is true of this booklet, as well as of its German page-turner, "So Take My Hands!" - 4th Concordia Publishing House Easter Catalogue and Directory of Confirmation Certificates. F. B.

**The Bible Supply of Germany since the Reformation**. By Lic. Ernst Breest. C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 8 0 Pf.

According to D. Walther in Rostock, 18 prints of complete German Bibles, 22 psalteries and 12 prints of other biblical books have survived from the years 1466 to 1522. The present, excellently orientating book now shows on 109 pages how the Bible has been spread in Germany since Luther, namely 1. from Luther to Francke, 2. by the Cansteinsche Bibelgesellschaft in Halle and elsewhere in the 18th century, 3. by the "Christentumsgesellschaft" and the forerunners of the German Bible societies, 4. by the numerous Bible societies in the 19th century. Interesting are several quotations from Catholic Bible editions. At the end of the Dietenberg edition of 1534 there is a "Speech of this Bible to all German Christians", which begins: "Come, all you Germans in general, come, all you Christians, great and small".

Kompt hehr on Forcht, lesst mich allein Bei mir habt ir Gots Wort gantz rein." Eck's Bible of 1537 bears the dedication, "Allen frommen Christen zu Nutz." In Ulenberg's edition of 1630, H. Sierstors wrote: "The Bible is, among other many landscapes, communicated to our dear Germany by God-loving and holy apostolic men . . . and also delivered into the hands of the common man . . . that those who waver in faith may be uplifted . . ... and the true catholic ones were more encouraged ... . . and that because of the causes, as until then one had forbidden the leyen and other secular people to read the Bible, also not wanted to allow that such a holy and godly book should be transferred and interpreted into the common German language . . . these . . ... lies and to reveal them to the whole world ... . . have been encouraged out of special respect by high spiritual and secular persons, highly learned men, who have put the Bible into our mother tongue and brought it to light in public trucks for the benefit of dear Germany. In the preface to the Bible published by H. Braun in 1788, it says: "A book that is the only indispensable one with regard to the whole of mankind as well as to the individual." Finally, in the preface to the "Holy Writings of the New Testament," published in Munich in 1789: "The wish that the true worshippers of Jesus would choose the Gospels and the writings of the apostles and disciples of Jesus as the most excellent book of edification will certainly not be a wish that deserves the rebuke of any bright and pious thinker." Breest remarks: "These quotations date from the time when the Jesuit Order was raised up by Clement XlV." "Praise be to God," wrote Goßner as late as 1808, "at last we have a Wohlseile edition for our Catholic people." But as early as 1816 Pius VII condemned the Protestant Bible societies, and in 1817 he also abolished the Regensburg Institution, where the Wohlfeile Bible welcomed by Gotzner had appeared. And at the end of last year a decree of Pius X. also abolished the Jerome Society, the only society for the propagation of the Bible in the Roman Church. F. B.

**Holy Places in the Land of the Bible.** By Lic. Dr. J. Böhmer.
Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: M. 1.20.

A rich literature has been written about Palestine in the last decades. The chapters of the present writing of 140 pages bear the following headings: "Emmaus, The Desert, Anathoth, Shiloh, Shechem, Samaria, Nazareth, The Tabor, The Lake of Galilee, Caesarea Philippi, The Jordan, Jericho." The author knows how to skilfully wrap the most important facts from ancient and modern times, especially from the time of Jesus, around the above names, and also to let edifying thoughts flow in, which, however, are not always accurate, e.g. what is said about the "Special Creed" on page 14. Of the walls of Jericho, the excavation of which was begun in 1908 by Prof. Sellin of Vienna, Böhmer says: "From the north side the old city wall was found, namely the pre-Israelite, Canaanite wall. It is a most interesting structure, such as none has yet been found: the base is formed by a thick cyclopean wall, put together of large unhewn stones. Its exterior runs obliquely at the top, curving somewhat outward at the bottom. The embankment is smooth and well-fitted. Boulders, some of immense size, up to 2 meters (78^ inches) in length, are used for the foundation wall. The wall is about 4 meters high. . . . From this stone wall with a sloping embankment was then set up the actual vertical wall of large adobe bricks in a thickness of apparently 1½ meters." F. B.

**Once and Now in the Holy Land**. By P. O. Eberhard. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 80 Pf.

This writing of 96 pages we have read with great interest. It throws many bright lights on the understanding of Scripture. The author says of his journey in the Holy Land: "We spurned the leisurely pilgrim's stride and the well-trodden tourist paths and roamed remote regions for weeks on uncomfortable paths under the most expert guidance. We have always sought the closest contact with the life of the people and have striven to gain an understanding of the country's unique landscape. Thus arose

the loose sketches of land and people, of nature and culture, of customs and manners, of life and death, as we find it all today in the Arab country among fellahs and Bedouins, and as it permits an inference or throws a light on the Biblical past of the land." The headings of each section are as follows: "Shirocco, harvests, plough, cruelty to animals, dogs, milk and honey, sheep's clothing, finery, superstition, narrow gate, house, corner-stone, hand-mill, wedding, dance and round dance, burial, mourning customs, tomb of the Saviour, synagogue, ways, buying out ears of corn, hospitality, inns, tent, desert, water, cisterns, lily, rose, fig-tree, vine, olive-tree, names, conclusion." F. B.

**The Bible - The Word of God.** An exposition and defense of the Lutheran doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By **Lic.** Dr. Oskar Bensow. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 60 Pf. .

Bensow is a lecturer at the University of Upsala and originally published this work in Swedish. His position on the question of inspiration is close to that of D. Nösgen, from whom he also repeatedly refers. As with Nösgen, so also with Bensow the fundamental error is that inspiration and revelation are not properly distinguished. In historical, scientific, and similar matters, Bensow does not admit reality, but he does admit the possibility of error. Bensow writes: "We would reply to this, first of all, that we do not know of a single case where it has been proved to full evidence that there was a real error, while on the other hand we know of many cases where alleged errors have finally proved to be correct statements, or where it has turned out that the 'error' was brought about only by misunderstanding the text." "In such" (peripheral) "areas, therefore, errors and misspellings are possible as a result of the human self-activity of the author, even though inspiration has not ceased. " F. B.

Pastors and politics. By P. Th. Wahl. Published by Chr. Belser, Stuttgart. Price: 80 Pf.

This. This scripture encourages the pastor to political activity and gives hints on how he can cooperate in the political education of the people, which, however, corresponds to Calvinism, which mixes secular and spiritual, state and church, but not to Lutheranism and Scripture. The following statements are interesting: In 1908 there were 520 Catholic political journals in Germany, of which in Prussia 319 against 1 in 1822, not including the flood of edifying and religious papers. The Catholic People's Association had 610,000 members last year, employed 30 machines and 66 persons in its press headquarters, and had distributed no less than 94 million printed matter by the middle of 1904.

F. B.

On Religion. Selected Pieces from Religious Literature from Luther on to the Present. By J. Paust. Published by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig. Price: M. 1.20.

From 139 pages in small octavo, pieces of religious content are offered here by Luther, Lessing, Herder, Schleiermacher, Novalis, Arndt, Schenkendorf, Bousset, Chamberlain, Naumann, Frenffen, Knapp, Spitta, Sturm, Gerok, A. Harnack, Sohm, Encken, Funke, Salomon, Th. Kaftan, Dryander, Förster, R. Seeberg, Luthardt and others. These selections are calculated, in the first instance, for instruction in higher girls' schools. It is mostly liberal spirits from which pieces are offered. The purpose of this book can therefore only be to make propaganda for modern "Christianity". F. B.

Force and substance. Consciousness and Life. By Fr. Otto Werner. Published by Max Kielmann, Stuttgart. Price: M. 2.40.

Werner has already repeatedly argued that the essence of nature is not substance but force, and that everything that is transformed from nature into life,

Werner's theory is based on his own experiments as well as on those of Hans Driesch and others. Werner's theory is based on the fact that the force that passes into will and consciousness is permanently withdrawn from nature, that the theorem of the quantitative constancy of force in nature is therefore untenable, and that all movement is based on this withdrawal of life from nature. Werner bases his theory on his own experiments, as well as on those of Hans Driesch and others. This little book of 131 pages contains the following essays: "1. Is materiality the essence of things? 2. from which conditions follows consciousness and life? 3. 3. the cause of the earth's rotation, or: what does life feed on?" This writing directs its point against Häckel and all deniers of an otherworldly world. F. B.

**THE WAY OF LIFE, or: Why Should You Be a Christian and a Church Member. By *G. Luecke.* American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa**. Price: 30 Cts.

This book of 96 pages in small octavo deals with the following topics in eleven chapters: "**1- Is there a God? 2. The destiny of man. 3. Is the Bible the Word of God? 4. The God of the Bible. 5. Christianity versus unbelief. 6. Christianity versus other religions. 7. our hope of salvation. 8. repentance and conversion. 9. why join the church? 10. Does it make any difference what church you join? 11. Why you should join the Lutheran Church**." This exceedingly clear, pleasing, and concise apologue of Christianity and Lutheranism we have read with great interest, and we doubt not that it will be much blessed. F. B.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE ELEVENTH CONVENTION OF THE Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri and other States. American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa**. Price: 8 Cts.

Besides the usual business, this Synodal Report contains an excellent, timely, clear paper

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

According to **the annual report of the Lutheran Pilgrim House, 8 State - Straffe, New York,** 58,834 Germans were admitted during the past year. The number of guests at the Pilgrims' Home was 3445, of whom 1359 were German and 1022 Scandinavian visitors, 624 German and 440 Scandinavian emigrants. Work was found for 174 emigrants. Poor people received 572 meals, 174 night's lodging and provisions for onward travel. For charitable purposes $270.57 was expended. Loans without interest amounted to $474.25. $1500.00 was transferred to the Synodical treasury from the reserve fund and $1000.00 was left as loans **on demand.** Gifts and collections for the mission amounted to $1435.26. Emigrant Missionary Fr. Restin writes: "For the benefit and furtherance of the important work carried on at Pilgrim House, and in the interest of our mission, we ask all pastors and parishioners to make it a rule to use the services of Pilgrim House in transporting immigrants and in visiting the old country. If relatives or friends wish to immigrate, if members of the congregation wish to make a visiting trip, let the matter be placed entirely in our hands. If one has one's relatives or friends transported by secular agents, they will usually take such routes.

where they do not even meet us. It often happens that immigrants are in distress and embarrassment when they land. The secular agent, who has pocketed the money for the ship's tickets, really does not take care of the people; he is not on the spot to be able to help. So we have to help and do what is necessary to change the situation. The relatives send letters and telegrams, and we must do the work where the agents have put the profit in our pockets. If all orders were transferred to us from the Synod for ship's tickets, money shipments, and money transactions, we should be able to cover all. To be able to meet all expenses abundantly without assistance." This is true, also of our Emigrant Mission at Baltimore, over which Rev. R. Eirich, 3020 East Baltimore St., presides. F- B.

**The Lutheran World and "Lehre und Wehre".** In its last number of last year, "Lehre und Wehre" reported on various symptoms of indifferentism within the General Synod and especially on the sad denial of D. Delk to the Papists and even to the Jews, and of his ecclesiastical fellowship in the Jewish Temple with Rabbi Krauskopf and other open deniers of the Deity of Christ. Now, since the ***Lutheran World,*** compared with the ***Lutheran Observer, is*** generally regarded as conservative, it was to be expected that this paper would agree with us decidedly in its judgment of Delks' denial of the truth. But instead of endorsing "Doctrine and Defense," the ***World of*** January 12 writes: "**For discreditable polemics, for tortuous twisting of facts to make out a case, and for persistent and inexcusable unfairness, commend us to our brethren, or at least to some of them, of the Missouri Synod.**" With these and similar general remarks, the ***World*** believes it can vindicate the General Synod and refute "doctrine and woe." In no single point does the ***World*** deny that we have rightly reported the facts. And as to the inferences drawn by "Doctrine and Defense" from the facts stated, and the judgments passed upon them, the ***World does*** not take the trouble to prove any of them seriously false. Indeed, if we have understood the World rightly, it too does not consider Delk's conduct to be a special offence. As to the criticism in "Doctrine and Defense," the ***World*** remarks. "**It *(L. u.* W.) still thinks that we are a little loose in the exercise of discipline upon offending members, *i. e.,* offenders from its standpoint.**" But is this really the opinion of the conservatives in General Synod, that acts such as Delk has been guilty of do not constitute an offense, an offence, from the standpoint of General Synod? We confess that up to now we have held the ***World in*** higher esteem. In particular, the ***World*** also complains that we hold the General Synod responsible for all that is publicly preached and printed in its midst. The ***World*** remarks with reference to "Doctrine and Ways": "**It proposes to hold the General Synod responsible for all of its individual members who write or speak things not agreeable to the canons of the Missouri Synod.**" That a synod is responsible for the public teaching, writing and doing of its synod members, seems to be understood even by the conservative element in the General Synod. And yet it is just this living consciousness of responsibility for the synod members that is the

**conditio sine qua non of** a truly Lutheran and Union-free confessional position of a synod. As long as the General Synod does not call its pastors and professors to account on principle and does not want to call them to account when they (as has been the case up to now) teach falsely, for example, about the Lord's Supper, about baptism, about absolution, etc., or otherwise publicly deny the Lutheran truth by their practice, so long it is and remains a unionist community. We must confess that in this respect, too, we had expected better from the ***World.*** After all, it stood up for the confessional statements of the General Synod of 1895, 1901 and 1909, as reported in "Lehre und Wehre" and which we intend to discuss in more detail in the near future! The ***World*** has also occasionally put in a good word for the other Lutheran symbols. But as long as it adheres to the principle that the General Synod is not to be held responsible for the public teaching and activities of its professors, pastors and congregations, there can be no question of a truly union-free and healthy Lutheran position in the ***World either.*** True Lutheranism exists only where the full Lutheran truth is confessed, and that, as Concordia so often emphasizes, "with one accord." A mixed body, in which many profess the Lutheran symbol without reserve, but many do not, and in which many stand up for Lutheran truths, but many deny and fight Lutheran doctrines, such a body is. not a truly Lutheran body. And if even those who in such a body stand up for the Lutheran confession and the Lutheran doctrines are silent on principle to the doctrinal deviations and denials of truth on the part of the other members, such a union also lacks the appearance of true Lutheranism. F. B.

**"The Struggle for the Parochial School."** Such is the heading of an article in the "Church Gazette" of Reading, from which we share the following paragraph: "If we are to fight the battle for our parochial school victoriously, we must first seek to overcome indifference. We pastors must not tire of urging upon our church members the blessings of a Christian school. Above all, we ourselves must be convinced that Christian schools are a necessity for our children, for our congregations, and for our whole church. It is not enough to say, Christian schools are a good thing, but if we do not or cannot have them, we must look for a substitute for them. Christian schools simply cannot be replaced by anything else, not by Sunday school, not by a Saturday school, not by a few hours of religious instruction a week. If our young Christian people are to be firmly established in the faith and profession of our church, we must have Christian schools; we must have them at all hazards; and if we have them, we must keep them, cost what it may. All those familiar with the heathen mission agree that the school is the foundation of missionary work. Shall our Christian children have less than the poor Gentile children? And how can we build our church unless the foundation is laid in Christian schools? We are like the gardener who seeks fruit, but cares not for the care of the tree on which the fruit grows."

**The "Lutheran Zionsbote",** the German paper of the General Synod, writes p. 360: "Our Wartburg Synod has had to struggle with special obstacles and difficulties from the beginning of its foundation. It was composed of pastors and congregations who had formerly been connected with English district synods. This circumstance brought it many a disadvantage from the beginning. It often lacked internal harmony; not a few of its pastors, who had formerly been connected with other bodies, left it again for one reason or another, and consequently it always had to reckon with the difficulty of finding pastors for its congregations. She could not rely on the English part of the General Synod. Even if they showed good will, there was no question of active help from their side. There was no real understanding of the actual situation. German youths who had studied at the English institutions were drawn over to the English work one by one. A change for the better did not occur until a connection was made with Breklum in Germany and young men were won for our congregations from there. From that time our German synods were not only enabled to supply their old congregations with pastors, but also to do missionary work more vigorously than before, and to plant new congregations." The "Zionsbote" also complains of relatively poor support for the German work on the part of the General Synod. He writes: "In the hall of the Wartburg Synod it was statistically proven to the representative of the Inner Mission Authority that since its existence the Synod has paid into the treasury of the Inner Mission a considerable sum more than it has received in support from it. It received a total of $6688, whereas the Kansass Synod received 8107.122. The English missionary work costs proportionately more to maintain than the German. Not only do the American pastors, on the average, make larger claims, but in most cases it requires a much longer time for an English missionary congregation to become independent than for a German one. There have been cases where English mission churches have been supported from the mission treasury for more than twenty years. It is a rarity for a German congregation to ask for support for more than four or five years, and then the amount is usually not large. According to the latest statistics, the General Synod supports a total of 220 mission congregations. Of these, 29 are in the German part, and of these there are those in which more English is taught than German. Two fall to the Wartburg Synod." The same paper remarks: "It cannot be denied that the real aim and endeavor of the General Synod, as far as the German work is concerned, is to Americanize the foreigners as quickly as possible. And this is true not only of the language, but also of their ecclesiastical methods of labor." "And also in doctrine and practice," the "Zionsbote" should have added. For to this very end has hitherto been the endeavor of the General Synod to fill up the gulf between the Lutheran Church and the sects. F. B.

**Not God, but man himself is to blame when he is lost.** This scriptural truth is denied by the Reformed "Theologische Zeitschrift".

She writes (7:23 f.): "If we assume that the reason lies in man, in his will, that is, that one decides to accept out of his own choice and determination, while another for the same reason throws away the grace of God, we would again come to the new question: why the one in this way and the other differently? Whence the difference of the one human race? Our Reformers solve the question in this way, that the reason of such difference can only lie in the conduct of God, since he did not create two kinds of men; it is his incomprehensible grace why he effectually enlightens the one, but not the other; why he brings the one out of his sins, while he leaves the other in his sins." The truth that God earnestly desires that all men should be helped, and that the fault why some are lost is not in God, but solely in man, is here denied. Even the reason why some reject the grace of God, according to the Reformed, is "only in the conduct of God." Like the Synergists, the Calvinists deny that **discretio** is a mystery. The Synergists place the **causa discriminis** in man, the Calvinists in God. Lutherans, however, speak separately according to Scripture: God alone is the cause of blessedness, and man alone is the cause of his damnation. But this very scriptural recognition of the mystery is derided by Synergists (Ohioans) and Calvinists, both of whom follow their reason. F. B.

**"Socialism and faith in God,** as taught by the Christian faith, do not get along, cannot get along, virtually exclude each other. Socialism only makes sense when it presents itself as denying God, when it declares that we do not need the so-called help of God because we are able to help ourselves. Only the man who no longer believes begins to feel that he can do something. The worker who relies on his God and who assumes in his mind that everything God does is good - how can this worker develop revolutionary power to overthrow the social order which, according to his Christian faith, is instituted by God and approved by God? As long as he believes, he will not be able to have a truly revolutionary conception of things." This passage is shared by the "Z. u. A." from the Socialist "New York Volkszeitung." In Germany, too, the Social-Democrats have recently more than formerly dropped the mask: "Religion is a private matter," and have openly shown themselves to be atheists. F. B.

## II. Abroad.

The synod of the Hanoverian Evangelical Lutheran Free Church adopted the "congregational order" in its third reading last year. From the "Sächsische Freikirche" (Saxon Free Church) we report the following: "Chapter 1 deals with the confession and church fellowship. § 1 of this chapter contains a round, clear confession of the Holy Scriptures as the divine word inspired by the Holy Spirit and as the sole source and guide of faith and doctrine, and likewise of all ecumenical and Lutheran symbols. § 2, 'Of Church Communion', reads: "1. Accordingly, as we hold all of these confessions

If we want to repudiate and avoid the opposing faith mongering of false unions, we know ourselves to be at one with all church communities and Christians in whom the above creeds rightly exist and are in force in such a way that they are taught and ecclesiastically acted upon. The words we have emphasized here are especially pleasing. For it is evident from them that the Hanoverian Free Church rejects not only the Prussian Union, but also the union between faith and unbelief prevailing in the so-called Lutheran regional churches, and that it is not content with the mere 'right standing' of the confessions, but also insists that what is written on paper shall also come into force'. How this is applied, of course, is another question. It says in the following paragraph, which in our opinion belongs to that where one has gone into too much detail: In particular, our church maintains altar fellowship with the independent Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hesse and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia. Although this corresponds to the actual circumstances, it does not belong in a congregational order, because the confessional status of every visible church community can change or be corrupted. And that just now, when not only the position of the Breslau Synod in relation to the Hanoverian Regional Church, but also its position in relation to inspiration, has given rise to grave misgivings even within the Hanoverian Free Church, this paragraph has been included or left standing, clearly shows that the spirit of unionism has not yet been overcome there, in spite of all laudable striving for confessional fidelity." "But as regards the relation of the 'church regiment' to the individual congregations, this 'church regiment,' that is, the synodal committee consisting of the spiritual chairman (superintendent), two other pastors, and two laymen (possibly with legal knowledge), is granted too much power by leaving to it, according to Chap. IV, § 4, 7, 'the investigation and decision' of church discipline cases. The Lord Christ says Matth. 18, 7: "Tell the congregation! If he does not hear the congregation, consider him a heathen and a publican.' And here the individual congregation of which the person concerned is a member is undoubtedly meant." "If now, as was formerly done in the Lutheran regional churches under a certain pressure from the secular authorities, the congregations of the Hanover Free Church have transferred this right, to which they are undoubtedly entitled according to God's Word, to the synodal committee, we do not want to enter into a discussion with them about it now, nor do we want to be right about it, But we have to say that such a transfer should not have been done tacitly, that it should have been expressed somehow, especially in these congregational rules, that the church government in this matter (as in others) represents only the congregation. Otherwise this serves to obscure the pure doctrine of the Lutheran. Confession of the rights of the congregation. It is not sufficient for this that in Ch. VIII, § 8d, it is described as a right of the members of the congregation "to cooperate in fraternal and ecclesiastical discipline. For, according to God's Word, the exercise of brotherly and church discipline is properly the business of every congregation." "The position of the synod is also peculiar. According to Chapter II, § 3, it 'assists the synodal committee' and has '1. to establish orders, 2. to decide on their execution, 3. to decide on their implementation'.

3. to demand responsibility for the doctrinal judgments of the preachers' convention'. It is not clear whether the synod is superior or subordinate to the 'church regiment'. But since repeatedly, also e.g. in the question of church fellowship, the decision is assigned to the church regiment (Chap. IV, § 4, item 12), in practice at any rate a superordination of the latter results. The Synod is only a deliberative body, and not, as we in our Church understand it and hold with earnest, towards the congregations, to whom in all cases the final decision remains, but towards the Church Regiment, whose rule over the congregations is confirmed and fortified precisely by this position of the Synod. And when the synod is granted the right 'to demand responsibility over the doctrinal judgments of the preaching convention,' it is thereby deprived of the right, established by God's Word (Acts 15), to make doctrinal judgments itself." "A very striking point is found in ch. XI: 'Of Matrimonial Matters.' There it says § 8: 'The marriage ceremony before God's altar is not to be regarded merely as a blessing of the church, but as the conclusion of Christian marriage by God's word, and takes place according to Luther's order of marriage as per the Agende, since bride and bridegroom are pronounced conjugally together in the name of the Holy Trinity. Therefore, members of our church are guilty of a participatory sin if they attend as witnesses a national church "marriage ceremony" that creates a false appearance. Let pastors remind us of this more often.' And the -Kreuzblatt' also reminds of this, and in doing so declares that the country-church -marriages' are not regarded as real marriages. We would like to ask here whether it has really been made clear what this entails. Since the Hanoverian Free Church does not believe that the engagement is equal to the commitment after marriage, but considers the real commitment of Christian spouses to be possible only before God's altar, it can only be concluded from that sentence of the 'Kreuzblatt' that, according to the judgment of the 'Kreuzblatt' editor, all couples who are only 'blessed' in the regional church do **not** live in a Christian marriage! This should be seriously re-examined, for it contains a judgment which cannot be justified either by God's Word or by Luther's Marriage Book, to which it refers. It will perhaps be of use to return to this question of marriage, which was the cause of separation in Hanover, in some detail. Here we would only like to point out that by that judgment a great injustice is practiced against married couples of the Regional Church, and by that provision the conscience of our own parishioners is burdened without necessity. We had hoped that in time the Hanover Free Church would have come to a clearer understanding of this point." It is also made clear by the adopted "Church Order" that the so-called "Instrument of Peace" between the Hanoverian and Hermannsburg-Hamburg Free Churches, which has been adopted by both Synods, does not yet signify a church and altar fellowship between these Synods. The "Saxon Free Church" thus finally lets itself be heard about it: The "Instrument of Peace" is "not to be regarded as a final agreement on the basis of which church fellowship would be established between the two synods, but only as a

the provisional removal of certain obstacles to peace, which, however, were not only of a personal but also of a factual nature. This is already evident from the following sentence in No. 6 of the 'Kreuzblatt': Last year we had the joy of making peace with the Hermannsburg-Hamburg Free Church, even though it was not possible to achieve an actual church fellowship or even a union of the two churches. And it is confirmed by the fact that the congregational order, which was only adopted at the third reading of this year's Synod, mentions in Chapter I, § 2, Paragraph 2 only the independent church in the Hessian lands and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Prussia, but not the Hermannsburg-Hamburg Synod as such churches with which the Hanover Free Church maintains altar fellowship. Since, according to the report of the 'Kreuzblatt', changes, additions and deletions of a factual nature were also made during this third reading, it would have been possible to add the name of the Hermannsburg-Hamburg Free Church to those paragraphs dealing with church fellowship. The fact that this was omitted proves that, at least on the part of the Hanover Free Church, the 'Peace' is not yet regarded as 'actual church fellowship'. If, on the one hand, this reduces our misgivings about the 'instrument of peace' by giving room to the hope that the doctrines of inspiration, of church and ministry, of conversion and election by grace will be examined more thoroughly before a real church fellowship is concluded, on the other hand, we must ask what kind of 'peace' this actually is, which is not supposed to be church fellowship.

F. B.

**Ecclesiastical conditions in Schleswig-Holstein.** In Holstein there are Kirchspiele, to which up to 28 villages belong. From 1903-1908, 20 parishes were established in Holstein and one in Schleswig. In Schleswig there are on the whole 270 parishes, in Holstein, which is much more populous, only 170, and in Lauenburg 29. Church attendance in Schleswig averages only 6 per cent on Sundays, and hardly 15 per cent on festive days, and in Holstein the figure falls to 1-3/4, or 5-1/3 per cent, and in Lauenburg to 3-3/4, or 13¼ per cent. Of the men's world whole estates seem to be completely dechurched. It is just as sad with the communion attendance. In 1890 Kiel had 106 theological students, in 1908 only 36. The facilities and funds available for the training of candidates cannot be nearly utilized. In the last decade 127 candidates have been trained, and 106 declared fit for employment. At present four pastorates have remained vacant. Of children, over 7 percent remain unbaptized and of married couples, nearly 11 percent remain unmarried. One-fourth of the funerals are without church attendance. Drunkenness has decreased, but premarital sex has increased. The collections brought only 5 Pfennig per head in the year. 1499 have left the church, 1099 of them in Kiel. From 1901-1905 713 Catholics have converted and no one has become a Catholic, and of mixed marriages 9 per cent have been married Catholic and 75 per cent Lutheran. The Catholics number 45,000 souls with 39 priests. The "A. G." says of the Lutheran Church in Schleswig-Holstein: "Thus, in many cases, the church is only an external social institution, with which maintaining relationships is part of good manners.

When one is born, enters matrimony, when one dies, and especially when one is confirmed, the church is summoned; who else will care much for them! sleep everywhere!" This is true, though not in the same degree, of all the national churches. F. B.

**The "Reformation" on verbal inspiration.** On page 466 ff. this paper brings an article in which it speaks of the mischief that the false theory of berbalinspiration has wrought. Here we read: "An indisputable result of scientific work is this, that it has put an end once and for all to the so-called Berbalinspiration." "The belief in the literal truth and entire inerrancy of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, from the first letter of Genesis to the last of the Apocalypse, on the ground of verbal inspiration, was an error, we perceive; and from this fundamental error spring many a variety of other errors and damages." "Certainly the view of the verbal inspiration of Scripture may well be found in association with truly Christian life, but this is only a proof that the gospel still remains efficacious even in a false vessel. The connection between dead orthodoxy and verbal inspiration is not merely accidental and temporal, but thoroughly inward and essential. Where verbal inspiration finds recognition, it settles like a spell upon free inquiry, and becomes a grave obstacle to every scientific endeavor that strives for the knowledge of truth." "This theory (Berbalinspiration) has fallen, and it had to fall, for it was a grave error." Finally: "In sum: it is no longer to the letter of the Bible, to the 'It is written,' but to the power of the spirit and of life which lies in it and works from it, that the men of the present time bow down. It is characteristic of our time that it everywhere breaks up and casts aside purely external authorities and wants to acknowledge only that which inwardly carries overcoming power. And this is right; for it corresponds also quite alone to the dignity of man as a free personality, in whom God recognizes his own image. He does not compel us by demanding submission to a Scripture that is infallible to the letter, but by acting as the Spirit upon our spirit and bringing us to bow as free personalities before the power of his holy life and love. A Bible according to the doctrine of verbal inspiration would rape us and annul our personality. It would therefore be unworthy of God and of us. Voluntary commitment to Jesus Christ makes us free in all respects, free from the law, including the law of verbal inspiration. The vessel of the Bible is taken from the earth. Human history, human views and traditions, human knowledge, feelings and plans have given the material out of which it was formed, and we must not be surprised if human errors are also woven into it. We may therefore allow human science a free course; the Bible does not hinder it. We believe that it will only gain by it. In the earthen vessel, however, it carries a precious treasure from heavenly heights, the Word of God, and with it divine spiritual power and divine life. The way in which the divine and the human, content and form, interpenetrate one another cannot be reduced to a simple formula and cannot, as it were, be made chemically pure.

Divorce." Hereby, indeed, the word of JEsu, "The Scriptures cannot be broken," and the saying of the apostle, "All Scripture is inspired of God," are denoted as grave, injurious error, pernicious to the Christian life. F. B.

Count Pückler of Berlin also advocated **liberation from parochial compulsion.** "I ask," he writes, "Is it worse whether a pastor is once annoyed, or whether souls who have a real need of the bread of life find themselves unable, in an orderly way, to satisfy this their desire, year in and year out, perhaps for more than an age? Shall, for instance, a liberal phrasemonger really be allowed to annoy an ecclesiastical minority, or even an ecclesiastical majority, year in, year out, with his miserable pottage, without any possibility of remedying these hair-raising conditions? " F. B.

**Betrothal**. The "Old Faith" writes Sp. 1068: "If, for example, one of my children wanted to ask me for my permission to become engaged, I would downright reject this expression in a matter which, by its nature, is so entirely personal and, in its consequences for the parties themselves, so inevitably responsible for life. Prior consent, assuming maturity, I would hold to be a self-evident legal requirement only insofar as support with funds or other special services were called upon." As if a father could dispense himself and his children from the obligations of the fourth commandment! F. B.

**Of Luther's Catechism**, which the teachers in Zwickau have also trained with regard to his style, the seminary teacher Joh. Gillhoff writes: "In the Small Catechism, the entire linguistic genius of Luther shows itself in the fullness of his life. His style is so personal that one searches in vain for it in contrast to the so-called paper style. His language is unparalleled in its royal power, in its compact force, in its serious beauty. ... There is a piece of eternal youth on the few thin leaves. Luther was allowed to immerse himself in the inexhaustible youthfulness of the German way of life, was allowed to fall back on the backstreets of the peasantry and its language. Nevertheless, the smell of the earth does not predominate, but the air of the heights lies spread over the thin leaves, and light from above floods them. Both these factors prevent these leaves from drying out or withering in the course of the centuries. The sense of height, permeated by the healthy smell of clods, created a piece of eternal youth for them, which we still grasp with our hands, see with our eyes and love with all our hearts" (E. K. Z.).

**The draft of the new Penal Code** makes malice a prerequisite for the punishability of blasphemy and insults of religious communities. In the justification for this, it is stated that the law should not create an obstacle to permitted criticism, to serious scientific research. Cases in which (in the words of Prof. Kahl) "good faith, honest intention, holy wrath, stormy desire for truth, religious excitement have put the word on the lip" should not be met. So far, however, statements had also been made under the application of the so-called possible intent, which were more due to overzealousness in scientific or confessional disputes than to

had arisen from a bad intention. It therefore appeared justified to restrict the elements of the offence in such a way that freedom of conscience and free scientific discussion were preserved. The ultimate purpose of the offender must be to blaspheme and insult. By limiting the offence to this, all cases really worthy of punishment would remain hit. The deletion of "institutions and customs" is justified by the fact that this provision in the previous § 166 led to an application that went beyond what was necessary and, moreover, to unequal treatment of the religious societies, since the "institutions and customs" were not of equal importance for all of these societies, and for some other things came into consideration to a much greater degree, e.g. the founders of the religious societies and their teachings. There was a need for protection only in so far as the religious society itself was affected.
(A. E. L. K.)

**D. Rade, the leader of the liberals in Germany, accuses the** positives of backwardness at every opportunity, betraying at every turn what a shallow, thoughtless head he himself is. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "To the 'backwardness of our church,' which is to blame for the great ecclesiastical decline, Prof. D. Rade also includes the agendas, especially the use of the Apostolic: 'The use of the Apostolic, too, ought to be withdrawn from all compulsion; out of brotherly love, church members who take pleasure in it should renounce its recitation in favor of church members who take offence at it, and do not wish to renounce it; so it will one day come to pass, when our church understands itself. I am far from thinking that the moment the Apostolic is omitted from the liturgy, the "alienated," etc., rush in heaps to the service; but the partly understandable, partly incomprehensible offence which many church members take at that old formula prevents them from coming to the joy of the service, and thus hinders their access to the Gospel, which would otherwise find their hearts in song, Scripture reading, sermon, and prayer. This is motive enough for a motherly church to abandon or release the custom of a formula and form. For their recitation belongs to the "ceremonies" in the sense of the Reformation, which need not be one and the same! Indeed, even today church members who are firmly attached to the altar feel comfortable in national churches and services that do not have the formula in public worship. Coercion in such matters is backward. Let the congregations have a great liberty to order their own worship." Has D. Rade forgotten that 'in song, Scripture reading, sermon, and prayer" occurs exactly the same as in the Apostolic? If, then, the church wishes to be entirely 'motherly,' she must send forth a commandment that nothing may be sung, prayed, read, or preached in the divine service to which modern men 'take offence." Did not D. Rade say to himself that if this happened it would be the end of the church?" To bring modern man to the Gospel, one must banish the Gospel from the Church. This is summa of D. Rade's wisdom.

F. B.

**How closely related papism and liberalism** are, is evident from the following propositions, which were made at the Regional Church Scientific Conference in Schleswig-Holstein: "1. not a sense of guilt, but

The strong inhibition of the inner life and thus of the whole life is the need of our time. 2. 2 A proclamation that follows the orthodox doctrine of justification must therefore miss its goal. (3) Grace is not primarily forgiveness, but endowment with the power of inner life. (4) This inner life gains its content and thus its solid foundation not through the proclamation of isolated facts of salvation, but through the proclamation of the praying and believing Jesus as the revelation of God still alive in the Word today. Only he who is redeemed to such a life can be educated to a true consciousness of reconciliation, which is not a powerless self-soothing, but a source of strength for cooperation in God's saving work. These inner experiences are experienced as absolute miracles and exclude a strict implementation of a causal view of the world, but lead with necessity to the thought of predestination. The orthodox way of looking at things inevitably results in the perpetuation of a legal way of thinking, and rests on a sub-Christian apprehension of God. If one wants to chide this whole way of looking at things as "new faith," it must be said that only he has truly "old" faith whose consciousness of reconciliation rests on the unbroken doctrine of two natures and the unshaken certainty of the verbal inspiration." Luther and Melanchthon complain much about "idle, inexperienced bellies" who had no understanding of the doctrine of justification. According to the above theses, these people include the liberals: real Papist saints and self-righteous Pharisees. Yes, Modernism is closer to Papism than the Pope and the Moderns want the word to be. To the highest of all questions, How shall I be blessed? both give essentially the same wrong answer. F. B.

**Of the Gospel of John,** the textual critic Prof. Gregory of Leipzig remarks: "One of the disciples may well have been closer and more like Jesus in his innermost being. I assume that John was this disciple. . . . It must be remembered, moreover, that a disciple intimately attached to his Master, if so disposed, especially if still comparatively young, would be most likely to make his Master's manner his own. If the fourth Gospel is directly traceable to a disciple, the Jesus of that Gospel may be the true Jesus." Hitherto it has been regarded by the higher critics as a long settled and self-evident fact of science that the Gospel of John is not genuine, and that the JEsus of it is a figment of imagination. Now science is turning back again. F. B.

**Apologetics**. D. Hoppe gave a lecture on "Miracles" in Lüneburg, the content of which the "H. P. K." reports with the following words: "The Holy Scriptures report of miracles, already in the Old Testament, but more so in the New Testament, especially the miraculous activity of Jesus. Striking and extraordinary as these miracles are, should the reporters, should the eye and ear witnesses have been mistaken? If so, Jesus would have chosen as his witnesses those who were absolutely incapable of reporting what he had done; and if they did not deserve faith in regard to what they saw, in regard to the deeds of Jesus, neither did they deserve faith in regard to what they heard, in regard to the words, the teachings of Jesus, so that with the truth of the miracle reports the truth of the Bible,

the truth of Christianity stands and falls. Or should Jesus have had at his disposal forces of nature unknown at that time, such as magnetism and the like, should he also have had at his disposal such forces of nature which we do not know today, but which we will recognize later on as our knowledge of nature progresses, so that the miracles of Jesus can basically be explained naturally? At any rate, according to the biblical accounts, it is not so. According to them, Jesus acted supernaturally, in possession of divine omnipotence, at any rate, on the basis of his request to God, absolutely disposing of divine omnipotence. Such an assumption would amount to the reproach that JEsus had deceived his disciples and the other eye-witnesses, would make JEsum an immoral personality, an impostor or a swindler. By natural means the miracles of JEsu (resp. of the prophets and apostles) are absolutely inexplicable. But does not the law of nature oppose the report of the working of miracles, and make them appear impossible? The law of nature is usually regarded as an immutable quantity (e. g., by Harnack), so that every deviation from the law of nature would indeed be impossible. But the law of nature is by no means immutable. The laws of nature are not given by God, but made by men, that is, on the basis of observation of certain uniform phenomena men have taken this and that to be natural law. In the course of time, however, even in recent years, it has not infrequently been recognized that a law of nature has been wrongly established; such a law of nature has had to be modified or even dropped as quite wrong, so that, in fact, the law of nature is something very changeable. One of our most eminent representatives of natural science said to the speaker at the last great meeting of natural scientists that he no longer regarded anything as impossible. Now, of course, we shall have to take it for granted that, according to the laws of nature, we human beings will not be able to walk on water, for example, as reported by Jesus. We shall have to say that we are bound by what is generally understood by natural law. But we must not suppose this of God, the pure Spirit; not only the interest of faith, but that of science forbids it. Spirit is capable of acting upon nature, the human spirit, much more the divine spirit. God, however, who created nature, and who also sustains it according to certain rules, will not deviate from the rule in a capricious manner, after the manner of a juggler, a magician; but if He deviates from it, He always has His reason for doing so. The preparation of salvation, the awakening and strengthening of faith, is given in Holy Scripture as the reason of the divine working of miracles. The miracles of Jesus appear acceptable only when his miracles are God's miracles, when he is something else, when he is essentially higher than all other men, when he is really what he claims to be: the Son of God, even God himself. Natural science has not the least reason to doubt the divine miraculous activity of Jesus, nor the divine nature of Jesus, nor even his supernatural birth and bodily resurrection; for these things do not belong to the domain of natural science, but to the domain of the spirit, they do not want to happen and be explained naturally, but supernaturally. In particular, his virgin birth has been even less doubtful for the last six years than it was before, ever since the

The discovery of the not rare parthenogenesis in the animal world has been made. Not that this discovery somehow made Jesus' supernatural birth explicable (that is, by natural means); but if virgin birth already occurs in nature, natural science has no reason and no right to consider Jesus' virgin birth impossible. With regard to the resurrection of JEsu, it must be remembered that His body, though the same as before (the tomb was empty), was yet not a natural one, or rather did not exist in the old way, but was a pneumatic one, so that natural science, because not falling within its domain, cannot prove and explain, nor deny, the appearances of the Risen One." When asked if miracles still exist today, D. Hoppe said in private conversation, "There are no miracles today and have not been for a very long time. There are answers to prayer, there is an influence on God through prayer, there are such striking miracles that they appear to us as miracles, but there are no miracles in the biblical sense (such as the healing of a man born blind or a leper through a single word, and that at the same moment that the word is spoken); the biblical miracles are rather unique in their kind."

**Bible and Babel.** **Lic. theol.** Galley-Colmar says in an article in the "A. E. L. K." (p. 416) about the Assyrian-Babylonian excavations: "In conclusion we will have to say about the contacts between Babel and the Bible in the field of prehistory that, in spite of all the affinities of the narrative materials, the biblical reports nevertheless show so many original features and such a strongly pronounced peculiarity that a literary reworking of Babylonian models seems virtually impossible. Rather, there is a common tradition belonging to the original possession of mankind, which in Israel as well as in Assyria-Babylonia has gone through its independent history until it was fixed in writing. When the ancient traditions began to fade more and more and their religious content threatened to be lost, God, through a unique intervention based solely on His hidden plan of salvation - the calling of Abraham - from the circles of the North Arabian Semites, who had most faithfully preserved the heritage of the fathers of primeval times, chose for himself a man, a family, a people, who carried forward that material of tradition in such a form as God deemed necessary to convey purely to posterity the religious goods contained in the primeval stories." The hypothesis that the Bible depends on Babel has its support not in excavations, but in preconceived errors and dogmas of unbelief. The Bible never comes into conflict with facts, but with all kinds of thoughts in which men wrap facts. F. B.

According to unbelieving researchers, the **Christian belief in the Trinity** is supposed to have originated from the Indian doctrine: "Vishnu is Siwa and Siwa is Brahma - one being, but three gods". According to "G. u. W.", however, E. Lehmann says in his History of Religion: "With the Christian Trinity, to whose favor or disadvantage one has often enough wanted to apply the Indian parallel, this combination of gods has only little resemblance. Trimurti has never become a dogma or a real theory; nor has it had any appreciable importance either for faith or in speculation. It is merely an expression of the Indian syncretis-.

of the zeal of the cults, which we encounter especially in Hinduism at every turn." Of a pre-Christian occurrence of a doctrine of the Trinity Lehmann knows nothing. Prof. Krüger, who himself opposes the doctrine of the Trinity, also says: "However, a clear (non-Christian) influence has not yet been found here .

**On the characteristics of modern man,** D. Hunzinger says: "Modern man takes offence precisely at the fact that an alien justice should stand up for me, that another should pay my debt. To stand up for myself, to pay myself - that is the moral thing. And how impressed people are by this morality of the strong spirit! But there is a great self-deception, a tremendous self-deception behind it. For it is not his moral sense, but his arrogance, that makes it -impossible for 'modern man,' as he says, to have his unrighteousness covered with JEsu's righteousness. He himself wants to pay with his own means? Yes, where are these 'own means,' where is this 'own righteousness'? They exist only in the imagination. This very conceit is something very old; it is the 'righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees' of which JESUS says that he who has none better cannot enter the kingdom of God. This 'moral sense' is further nothing but the beggar's pride of the notorious debtor, the banker-loser, who will not be helped that he may get out of his burden of debt, because he indulges in the delusion, to which so many have become bankrupt, that he can help himself." The qualities of modern man vaunted by many theologians are, when closely examined, for the most part nothing more than new names for the natural **lineamenta of the** old Adam. F. B.

**Of the excavations in Palestine,** D. Sellin of Rostock says: "How is it that the numerous evidence of Canaanite child sacrifices disappears in Israelite times? Does a straight line of development really lead to the spiritual God we know from the Bible? In contrast to the Egyptian and Babylonian seals, the seals found en masse in Palestine lack any mythological or religious representation. Predominantly only the old Hebrew name of God is written on it. Why is that? - We observe quite the same thing with the jars. In Israelite times the pleasing decorations disappear again, and only in recent times are they stamped with the name of Jahu. It is very striking that no male image of a god has ever been found in Palestine. How innumerable are found in Egypt and Babylonia. Bull images are found-whether used as lamps or as votive images we do not know. But human figures are not found. How is this?" D. Sellin sees in this an indirect proof of the religion of revelation in Israel. F. B.

**Mariolatry in France.** The Parisian of August 6 recommends the following prayer to Mary: "O Immaculate Virgin Mary, Almighty Mother of God and Merciful Mother of mankind, Queen of the Universe, I (name and first name), French citizen, in my name, in the name of my family, and in the name of all those who depend on me in any way, freely and solemnly recognize you in union with all Catholic France as the Queen of France, my dear fatherland. Therefore, I offer perfect devotion to your sovereign-

I pledge to your Immaculate Heart unbreakable submission and fidelity. Queen of the Church and Queen of France, as a testimony of my humble and glorious dependence, I wish to declare in particular my full submission to the Governor of Jesus Christ and my full devotion to the defence of his authority and the preservation of all his spiritual and temporal rights, as he shall be pleased to determine them. I beseech thee, lovely sovereign, that thou mayest preserve thy kingdom of France, and make it advance in obedience to its divine King, thy very dear Son Jesus Christ, who loves the Franks, and who, through the sacred host, so much desires to draw them all to himself, to dwell in them, and to make them live for him, to save them all."

**"Rome in Politics.** There has been no lack of voices among Catholic leaders openly declaring that America will be the burial place of the Roman Church. And it is true that many thousands are lost to Catholicism in this country every year. Nevertheless, this republic is the mainstay and the main hope of Rome. The cause is, that the American public at large and on the whole is but dimly acquainted with the history and true character of the Papacy. The Roman Church counts upon the ignorance, indifference, and good-natured soft-heartedness of Americans to accomplish her ends. Therefore, we have good reason to fear the political influence of Rome in this country. These liberal Americans should once come in contact with Catholicism where the same holds, or has held, supreme political power, as in Spain, Italy, or South America. There they would discover that the Roman Church believes in religious liberty only where it is weak. In those countries where it has supreme power, there is no religious tolerance. But where the Papacy has reigned longest and most unrestrained, it is now weakest. It has lost the respect and confidence of the people, however anxious it may be to regain the helm. The Italian government is determined to grant perfect religious liberty to all its citizens, and this is a stake in the flesh of the Vatican. When the Protestants at San Benevetto de Marsi had their meetings disturbed, and were persecuted, maltreated, and boycotted by the Catholics, the Government sent a strong detachment of troops to keep the peace, and as a result of the judicial inquiry 14 persons were arrested and punished, while a special suit was brought against the Catholic priest for having been the chief instigator of these disturbances of the peace. Nowhere has the Papacy less prestige or influence than precisely in Italy, where it is best known. Several recent events bear witness to this. Member of Parliament Antonio Fradelette of Venice introduced a bill to ban Catholic teaching from the public schools on the ground that it was immoral. Although the Vatican used all its power to prevent the re-election of this man to Parliament, he was nevertheless returned by a large majority of votes. In order to create in the Italian Parliament a 'Centre Party', such as exists in the German Reichstag, on which the Vatican could rely to oppose the government, the Pope had ordered

The Vatican revoked the decree which had forbidden Catholics to take part in the elections, and a list of Catholic parliamentary candidates was drawn up by the Vatican and sent to all the archbishops and bishops in Italy, with orders to take all means to bring about their election. Some of these means employed were in conflict with the electoral laws, and the result was that several of the electors are now in prison. In the birthplace of the present Pope, the priests paraded the streets with raised crucifixes and shouted to the people: 'If you do not vote for Indri' (the papal candidate) 'you will be struck by an earthquake as in Messina.' And at Messina the priests publicly declared that God had sent the earthquake to destroy the deputies of that district and to afflict Italy because they and others had voted for the bill banning Catholic teaching from the public schools." So writes the "Christian Apologist." But if even such men as Roosevelt and Tast display blatant ignorance with reference to the 'nature and history of the Roman Church, what can be expected of the great multitude of our citizens brought up in religionless government schools? F. B.

**"The Mohammedan"** - writes the "Messenger from Zion" - "regards his religion as more advanced than Christianity, the possession of which entitles him to look down proudly upon the Christians. That the Christian peoples are superior to the Mohammedans in pretty much every respect he sees and readily acknowledges, but he does not connect it with the religious basis of the people's life and does not acknowledge it when this connection is pointed out to him. To this must be added that the Christians, who have lived among the Mohammedans for centuries, have not conducted themselves in such a way that their walk and being have given evidence of their religious and moral superiority." Add to this the fact that the liberal "Christian" theologians do indeed believe less of God and of Christ than the Muselmänner. F. B.

In 1907, nearly 100,000 **copies of biblical books were** distributed in Spain, and 15,762 in Portugal. In Portugal, the sacred writings were often taken away from the distributors and burned; in Spain, they were thrown into the mud or into the water, and the messengers themselves were hardly protected from maltreatment. It is all the more gratifying that there is not yet a lack of priests and judges who are of a different mind and openly express their opinion. Thus a Portuguese priest told his parishioners that the Bible was the best book in the world, and that it would be good if everyone read it and obeyed it. On the other hand, another priest who had taken the Bibles away from the colporteur and burned them was sentenced to 35 days in prison and a not insignificant fine. And the Court of Appeal in Lisbon, on the appeal of a colporteur whose Bibles had been confiscated because they allegedly contained insults to the Catholic Church, ruled that there was not a word or sentence in the so-called Protestant Bibles that was not also in the Catholic Bibles, so that there could be no question of the Protestant Bibles being contrary to the principles of the Catholic faith; on the contrary, it was desirable that they should be read by the Catholic Church.

It was worthwhile that the Catholics followed the example of the Protestants and distributed the Bibles in good and cheap editions. (E. K. Z.)

**Christian Scientists in Germany**. Organized churches, i.e. full congregations, exist in Berlin, Dresden, Hanover. In the first two places English services are held in addition to German; in Hanover only German. Associations, i.e. preaching stations, exist in Frankfurt a. M. and Stuttgart, with both German and English services. Representatives are domiciled, apart from the places mentioned, also in Breslau, Leipzig and Trier. In the congregations and preaching stations there are also reading rooms. The names of the "readers" and representatives sound partly English. As it seems, there was temporarily also a representative in Hamburg. In her organ, according to American style, a column "Heilungszeugnisfe" (testimonies of healing) is regularly listed.

(Sch. H. K. u. Sch. B.)

The following report in the "A. G." shows **what kind of spirits are enthusiastic about the crematorium**: "The Zittau crematorium was inaugurated with the participation of numerous friends of cremation from the north and south, from the east and west, especially from Silesia and Bohemia, and unfortunately also with the participation of authorities who had nothing whatsoever to do with the celebration itself. What was offered in place of prayer, of this only a few examples. The prologue, written and spoken by a modern woman, described the idea of cremation as "redemptive", talked about the "eternal rest" in the crematorium and concluded with the wish: "You place of peace, remain what you always wanted to seem: a quiet destination, rest after the last walk and comfort in sorrow for souls timid and anxious! The chairman of the cremation society declared: 'Our striving will always be directed towards the fact that every human being, no matter to which religious community he belonged in life, can be blessed here in death according to his liking. In this temple of peace and tranquillity no strife and no intolerance shall find admittance!' "Every new cultural advance - and modern cremation is undoubtedly such an advance - has friends and enemies, supporters and adversaries. Why should it be any different with cremation? Who, alas, too often forgets that already in the imperishable poems of classical Hellas we are confronted with the poetry of the flaming grave and the urn. To the Homeric heroes the funeral pyre was piled, Aeschylus and Sophocles sing of ashes and urn. The Romans Martial, Propertius, and Tibull wet the ashes with wine. Our sea-mastering Norse ancestors directed their hero's woodpile on a ship; they had it thrust from the shore, and the hostile elements of fire and water devoured the hero's last earthly remnant! The torch that ignites the woodpile to Sigurd's corpse fire, ignites the world fire of the twilight of the gods. In the "Edda" Brunhild prays that on Sigurd's funeral pyre "the sorrowful breast burn her fire, with heat the harm melt in the fire"; in the "Beowulflied" the woodpile burned the Heerschildinge's best hero! Ladies and gentlemen! The German custom of cremation arose from the innermost depths of the Germanic folk soul. It may have been banned by force and by threat of capital punishment for more than baptismal years, but the longing for the pure and purifying flame has never been extinguished. All modern

Fighters for cremation have thus not fought for a new idea, but have only gained the merit of dressing a primeval German and ancient burial custom in a form that corresponds to the culture of the present day." He concluded with the wish: 'Blaze up, you flames, in the towering house, Scatter light and healing peace to men! Shine, thou white tower, from the heights out into the lands! Glow, you embers within, purify from the earthly garment! Clarify man's mind and turn it to the pure, holy goal: To unite life and death in the Godhead!" Most of the out-of-town guests, among them the president of the German Freethinkers' Association, praised the crematorium in glowing terms as a place of equality, brotherhood and tolerance. One Boehme said: 'As we like to come to you in life, so we also want to come to you in death. Our body will then rise into the German airs!"" - With such spirits some pastors in Germany are already cultivating fraternal fellowship by deigning to officiate in crematoria.' F. B.

"A play called 'Gretchen', which was banned in Berlin because of its indecent content and its mockery of the work of debauched women and fallen girls, has been performed repeatedly at the **Dresden Central Theatre.** It is particularly striking, indeed it must outrage every decent person, that even otherwise decent newspapers still publicly recommend this offensive play. Thus the reporter of the "Dresdener Anzeiger", which does not want to be counted among the filthy papers, praises the play by recommending "astonishing impudence" and that it "ridicules Serenissimus and the moral movement, the care of the Magdalenes and the hypocrisy of virtue", expressly emphasizes, that 'Ella Kobold performed the scenes delightfully with droll sinfulness', then admits himself that 'one ought really to turn away in disgust', but immediately adds that he did not do so because 'a certain loose, easy-going, ragamuffin grace was added'." So reports the "A. G." That is the peculiarity of most plays and novellas, that they surround the disgusting with grace and make it so attractive.

**Of the dangers of politics,** the "A. E. L. K." says, on the occasion of the terrible annoyance given to Schack by the member of the Reichstag, who had set up a kind of harem in his house: "For the psychology of this case, however, we do not need the consultation of a doctor; nervous breakdowns need not throw one off the moral track. No, the tragedy of Schack is that of the man of the great public in general. If any Schulze or Lehmann comes to Berlin, he is one among two million and goes his beaten track unnoticed; but if this Schulze or Lehmann has the "M. d. R." on his visiting card, he is a man of the public.If, however, this Schulze or Lehmann has the "M. d. R." on his visiting card, then all the metropolitan sensations and intimacies open up to him as a member of parliament, then he becomes a weighty person who is fetishized and has access everywhere, who today takes part in a gourmet dinner at some inauguration, tomorrow is invited to his "information" in the most naked "art lodges," and so on, until his simple mind whirls and he says to himself: "Here everything lives beyond good and evil! He who first thinks in this way is soon no longer catechism-proof either. Nor is the façade of the idealistic 'champion' un-

still rustle from the lips, but deep inside it hammers with a mad lust for the world, and soon the metropolitan bon vivant will stand before us. This is how I imagine the development of a man originally so cross-brave as Schack was, and, after all, one has precedents for it on all sides of the Imperial House."

**How the epidemic of lust is spreading in Germany can be seen** from the following figures in the "Köln. Volksztg.": "It has already come to such a point that the infection is beginning to become a public calamity, since innocent people are in danger of being infected. The unspoiled part of the German people, thousands of good wives, are thus plunged into misery. The large cities are rightly considered the hearth of contamination. Uncanny figures testify to it. Among 1000 recruits drafted in the years 1903 to 1905 from the following large cities were sick: from Essen 12.4 per cent each, Dusseldorf 13.2 per cent, Aachen 13.8 per cent, Munich 16.4 per cent, Hanover 18.5 per cent, Cologne 24.9 per cent, Leipzig 29.4 per cent, Hamburg 29.8 per cent, Berlin 41.3 per cent! According to statistics from 1907, 9 out of every 100 workers were found to be ill in Berlin, 16 out of every 100 young merchants, and as many as 25 out of every 100 students. So the sad fact stands before us that in the imperial capital a quarter of all students - there were 7194 students enrolled last semester - are to be regarded as contaminated. What does this mean for the future? for health? for the existence of our people? So much has been done for enlightenment; lectures of a warning nature are held at the universities; high school graduates are enlightened: where is the obvious salutary effect up to now? The statistics, after all, show the highest percentage precisely among students." Socrates, and with him our modern educators, teach: Enlightenment protects against sin; no one knowingly does evil. Paul says, "Knowing God's righteousness (that those who do such things are worthy of death), they not only do it, but also have pleasure in those who do it." According to the above statistics, who is right?

**Morals and medical practice**. The "Ref." quotes from the "Berliner Morgenpost": "We communicated these days a court case which ended in the punishment of a physician for certifying that a telephonist was unfit for duty on account of influenza, when in truth she had been delivered." "An old practitioner writes to us about the case mentioned: 'The convicted colleague has been too honest. I would have written the poor girl a false certificate too, but in such a way that I could not be caught. I have written such certificates before, and so have other colleagues. Though my last offence is barred by the statute of limitations, yet I beg the honoured editors not to betray me, for I intend to commit a similar crime more often, in order, when it seems to me expedient, after conscientious examination of the situation, to act not as a pedantic book-slave, but as a kindly helper in the spirit of my beautiful profession.'" The profession of a physician is, to be sure, a beautiful one. But it is all the uglier when the physician puts his art in the service of uncleanliness. And there is no lack of physicians who recognize this. From the physician D. Ziemann, for example, comes the word: "The physician who advises extramarital sexual intercourse commits an infamous crime. " F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. April 1910. No. 4.**

## The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53.

(Continued.)

The statement Isa. 53, 6 is the center of the JESAIC preaching of the suffering Messiah and introduces us to the innermost essence of the **satisfactio vicaria.** "We all went astray like sheep, each to his own way we were turned." This is the double sin of men: they have turned away from their Lord and Shepherd, the God of their lives, and go their own ways. They ask nothing of God, God's word, will, and commandment, but do as they please, walking after their own inclinations and lusts. But the LORD hath now taken away all our sins, and laid them upon his servant. XXXX XX XX XXXXX XXXX - "and the LORD caused to fall upon him the iniquity of us all." These words are usually interpreted by the more recent commentators to mean that the LORD caused our iniquity, in its consequences, to fall upon his servant. But the transposition of the expression "the iniquity of us all" into the other "our iniquity in its consequences" or "the consequences of our iniquity" is pure arbitrariness. The second half of 53:6, in its connection with the first half, gives only the sense: what was our own, lay upon us, that is, our erring ways, missteps, iniquities, the very things which the LORD laid upon his servant. This version is also demanded by the context. In the context vv. 4-6 the terms sickness, pain, punishment, iniquity, misdeed are clearly and sharply distinguished. If it were the prophet's opinion that the Messiah had only borne the consequences of our sin, he would have said just the same again in v. 6 as he had said before in v. 4. 5. And the progress of speech, the increase of thought in the passage v. 4-6, is yet unmistakable. First it was said that Christ had borne our sickness, our pains, all our woes, v. 4; then v. 5 characterized this woe as punishment; and now v. 6 emphasizes that to Christ was also laid the cause of all evil, all punishment, iniquity itself.

The Church sings innocently of the Lamb of God, "Thou hast borne all our sins, or else we should despair." But what does this mean, that Christ has borne our sins? Our iniquities, after all, are **facta,** precisely **male facta, which** have happened and now belong to the past. When Adam ate of the forbidden fruit, God summoned him before His tribunal. God, the Lord and Creator of mankind, also has a say when man, his creature, acts contrary to His will and commandment. God said to Adam, "Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat thereof?" With these words he laid his sin upon his head, reckoned what he had done as sin and transgression, held and pronounced him guilty. The excuses which first the man, then the woman, made did not hold sting. The first man and woman stood convicted of guilt, guilt-ridden before God's face. And now God dictated punishment to him. When Cain had slain his brother Abel, God called him to account/ With the words, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the earth," He imputed to him his blood deed as blood guilt. And this was followed by the sentence of punishment, "and now be thou accursed upon the earth." The sin is soon done, but not so soon put away. Sin, and even if it be the work of a moment, remains and clings to man, weighs upon man as guilt, as debt before God. Thus XX also gains the meaning "guilt." God holds man responsible for his actions. God looks at sin and holds man under sin. And no man can shift the guilt from himself, turn away the eye of God from his iniquity. The guilty man then meets the penalty. But now God, according to His wonderful counsel, has laid the total guilt of mankind upon His Son, and has no longer imputed the sin of the world to the world, but to Christ. "A little lamb goeth bearing the iniquity of the world and of its children."

Those commentators who understand our passage, v. 6d, to mean the interpretation and bearing of the consequences of sin, the punishment of sins, refer to Old Testament provisions of the law in which the expression XX XXX is used in the same sense. In the Law of Moses it is often said of one who has transgressed this or that particular commandment of God, or of one of God's commandments in general: XXXX XXXX or XXXX. Thus, for example, Lev. 6, 1; Num. 9, 13; Lev. 20, 19; 24, 15; Ezek. 14, 10. This is usually explained in such a way that the transgressor must take the consequences of his sin upon himself and suffer the deserved punishment. But this does not do justice to the full meaning of the Hebrew expression. In parallel sayings it is said of him who has violated a commandment of God: XXXX. Lev. 4, 13, 22, 27;
5, 2. 4. This can only mean: he is in debt, he is guilty of the law of the Lord, he is guilty before God. The two expressions

XXXX XXXX and XXXX are thus used **promiscuously,** treated as synonyms, and in one place, Leb. 5, 1, also placed side by side. Thus the former has the meaning which Gesenius-Kaußsch also records: to bear and atone for the guilt. The first and next consequence of the transgression is that the transgressor incurs guilt, that his sin is imputed to him by God. From this follows the other, that he must also atone for his guilt, suffer the punishment for it. Accordingly, Num. 5, 31, in contrast to the wife, who is convicted of adultery and must bear her guilt, it is said of the husband: XXX XXXX XXXX. The man is not guilty, but the woman. We further recall the well-known provision of the law Ezech. 18, 20, according to which the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor the father the iniquity of the son. This means that the iniquity of the father shall not be imputed to the son, nor the iniquity of the son to the father. This is evident from the addition, "The righteousness of the righteous shall be fine upon him (XXX), and the ungodliness of the ungodly shall be upon him." The righteousness of the righteous is upon him himself, adheres to him, to him alone, to no other, so that he stands precisely as the righteous, while the ungodliness of the ungodly is upon him, to him alone, as his own guilt. And so it is quite appropriate to the usage of language, the terminology of the law, when we understand Isa. 53, 6 XXXX XX XX XXXX of the imposition of guilt, of the imputation of sin. This naturally entails the vicarious bearing of the punishment, the consequences of sin. But the Prophet had spoken of this before. At the same time, it is evident from this comparison of our passage with the cited provisions of the law, that the Isaianic preaching, the gospel of Christ and the passion of Christ, is an entirely new, higher wisdom, which goes far, far beyond the law of the law. That which is not justifiable under the law, that the innocent should be charged with the sin of another, God has reserved for Himself as His privilege, as His majesty. He has laid the burden of all our guilt and iniquity upon his pious, faithful servant. The law, to speak with Luther, hangs our sin, our guilt, around our necks, because we have not kept any of God's commandments. But God, according to his unfathomable wisdom and causeless grace, has promised and sent to men whom the law has pronounced guilty a Redeemer and Substitute, who, instead of the guilty, stands before God as the self-guilty. Thus Delitzsch, one of the last representatives of the **satisfactio vicaria** among the moderns, calls Christ "the representative of the guilty, who stands before God as the self-guilty.

We refer briefly to two parallel sayings from prophecy, which reveal the same wonderful counsel of God. Already the prophet Nathan spoke of the future son of David, who would at the same time be

God's Son, prophesied: "if he sin," XXXXXX "I will punish him with the rod of men." 2 Sam. 7, 14. The suffering Messiah laments with David, "My sins have taken hold of me, that I cannot see; theirs is more than hairs upon my head, and my heart hath forsaken me." Ps. 40:13. Christ never committed a sin Himself. But the countless sins of all mankind he has so wholly made his own that he can say, these are my sins, I have sinned.

The saying Isa. 53, 6 is the basic passage, from which, as Luther and also more recent commentators note, similar New Testament **dicta,** such as Joh. 1, 29; 1 Petr. 2, 24, are taken. John the Baptist testified of JEsu, saying, *"Ιδε* **d αμνός** *τον 'Ονον,* **d αϊρων** *την αμαρτίαν τοΰ κόσμον.* "Behold, this is the Lamb of God, which bareth the sin of the world." Joh. 1, 29. Keil correctly explains **d αϊρων**. "If we deny the meaning to take upon oneself, we cut up the generally recognized connection of the saying with the prophecy of Isaiah. We prefer, therefore, the meaning take upon itself, which simply follows from the basic meaning take up, and includes bearing in itself, as in Matt. 11:29; 16:24. . . . *τήν αμαρτίαν* is sin with its consequences (i.e. chiefly sin itself), not the punishment of sin. This meaning has not. *ή αμαρτία τον* κόσμον**,** the sin of the world, thought of as one great mass." Christ took upon Himself the sin of the world, imputed it to Himself, and now bears it as a guilt, as His own guilt throughout His life. The whole course of JEsu's life on earth, up to His death, was one of uninterrupted suffering, and punitive suffering at that. And the cause of the suffering, the punishment, was not apart from him, in that he made the sin of men, which was foreign to him, his own. Christ, God's Lamb, the sin-bearer of the world, goes through the world atoning at every turn for what we have done wrong, and for what He Himself, by His own free choice, has been guilty of. Peter writes, 1 Pet. 2:24: δς *τάς αμαρτίας ημών αυτός άνήνεγκεν έν τω σώματι αυτόν έπι τό ξνλον* - "who himself bore up our sins in his body upon the wood." Keil remarks: "The words **τάς** *αμαρτίας ημών αυτός άνήνεγκεν* Peter unmistakably took from Isa. 53. ... *έν τώ σώματι αΰτον* is not, however, meant as if the sins had adhered to the body externally; but still less does the translation fit: in his body (Hoffn.), by which it would be said that the sins had entered into his body. Rather it is only to be expressed, that Christ had taken our sins upon Himself, and borne them up with His body to the cross, as a burden laid upon His body, and atoned for them by the offering of His own body and life to death as an atoning sacrifice." In the *άνήνεγκεν there* is a double: Christ, our Substitute, υτός *ήμών,* first took upon Himself our sins and bore them, vicariously bore our guilt, and

then carried our sins up to the cross and atoned for them through His death on the cross, thus suffering our punishment vicariously. Finally, an allusion to Isa. 53:6, and a further interpretation of this prophet's word, is contained in Paul's saying, "God made him who knew of no sin to be sin for us, that through him we might become the righteousness that is before God." The **abstractum αμαρτίαν** is stronger than the **concretum αμαρτωλός.** God has made the sin-
Christ was made sin incarnate for us. This is not merely to say that God treated him as a sinner, punished him, but rather that he imputed our sin to him, and thus regarded him as vain sin, a sinner and a transgressor. Christ, because our sin was upon him, stood before God as a sinner, as sin itself. To this then corresponds as an effect, that through him we have now become the righteousness that is valid before God.

*'Αμαρτίαν* **and δικαιοσύνη** *θεόν* are correlates. It is a question of validity before God here and there. The fruit of the **imputatio peccati,** that Christ was made sin, reckoned sin, for us, is the **justitia imputata,** which has now come to us through Him.

We now register some sayings of Luther and other old Lutheran teachers, which put the content and comforting content of the great word: "The HErr threw all our sin on him" into the light. Luther writes on Isaiah 53: **Nostrum peccatum est (Christus) ; quod ei fuit alienum, non habuit nec fecit, factum est ei proprium propter caritatem, qua nos amplexus est. Hoc portavit . . . tamquam ipse fecisset, qui tamen fuit innocentissimus. . . . . Ubique (Ps. 51. 40) confitetur peccatum totius mundi tamquam suum, sed tamen non suum proprie, sed factum suum. . . . Sive bene sive male egerim, nihil ad me, habes hic Christum pro me passum**. "Whether I have done good or evil, it is no concern of mine; I have Christ here who suffered for me." On Gal. 3, 13 Luther remarks: **Ipse quidem innocens est, sed quia portat peccata mundi, premitur ejus innocentia peccatis et reatu totius mundi. Personam omnium peccatorum gerere suscepit**. "He became the greatest of sinners." "This then is the only way by which one escapes the curse, that he believes in Christ, and says thus with comforting, certain confidence, My dear Lord Christ, thou art my sin and my curse." **Christus pro nobis factus omnium maledictionum, peccatorum et malorum nostrorum reus venit medius. In a sermon of Luther on Easter, Erl. Ausg. 11, 289, it is said: "For the eternal, irretrievable harm and eternal wrath of God, which we have deserved by our unremoved sins, no one can make reparation, except the eternal Person, God's Son Himself, and so that He stood in our place, took our sins upon Himself, and so Himself answered guilty for them." Melanchthon expresses himself similarly, C. R. XV, 46, 418. 1099: Voluit Deus Christum esse reum propter peccata nostra. - Christus dolebat,**

**se reum esse, ac si ipse se tuis et meis et omnium peccatis polluisset**. In this and like manner we are to paint Christ, the sin-bearer, before the eyes of our Christians. God looks at the matter as if Christ had done all that I have done, what evils I have done, as if Christ had defiled himself with my sins, and thine, and all men's. And that decides it; as God looks at the matter, so shall we look at it. Christ is guilty of my sin and of all the world's. O Lord Christ, thou art my sin. Whether I have done good or evil, it is none of my business. I no longer need to answer to God for my actions, Christ answers for me! Christ has taken all responsibility from me, taken it upon himself.

Luther's interpretation of Joh. 1, 29 is incomparable, which also applies Is. 83, 6. We will only highlight a few sentences here. "It is preached by Christ, our Saviour, in an exceedingly fine and comforting way; we can never attain it with words, nor even with our thoughts. In that life for ever we shall have our joy and our breath in the Son of God's lowering himself so low, and taking my sin upon his back; yea, not all my sin, but also the sin of the whole world, which is done from Adam even to the very last man, that he will have done, and will suffer and die for it also, that I may be without sin, and obtain eternal life and blessedness. Who can speak or think that the whole world, with all its holiness, righteousness, power, and glory, has fallen into sin and is of no account before God, and that anyone who wants to be saved and rid of his sin knows that his sins have all been laid on the back of the Lamb? John therefore shewed his disciples this Lamb, saying, Wilt thou know where the sins of the world are laid for remission? Look not unto the law of Moses, neither else run to the devil: for there thou shalt find sin, and be confounded and damned. But if thou wilt know and find a place where the sins of the world have been put to death and taken away, look unto the cross: and upon the back of this Lamb hath the Lord laid all our sins, as the prophet Esaias saith in the 63rd chapter, v. 6, We have all gone astray, as the lost and erring sheep; every one went his way. . . . What then is the right way, that we should not go astray? For the farther one goes from the right road, the more he goes astray. Isaiah answered, "This is the one on whom the Lord has laid all our sins, and has smitten him for the sins of his people; when we were all going astray, God laid all our sins on the back of his Lamb, and on no one else. He ordained the Lamb to bear the sin of the whole world. Therefore let a Christian be simple in this saying, and let him not be deceived by it.

let it be taken away. For there is no other consolation either in heaven or on earth, that we may be able to stand against all temptations, and especially in the pains of death." "Now learn here, that the law of Moses sheweth thee thy sin, and teacheth thee how thou oughtest to be obedient to God and man; saying also, that I am an enemy to God, blaspheming him, and that I live not according to it, as otherwise the ten commandments duly shew. In sum, the law shows what I am, reveals sin, and puts it on my neck, and does right by it. Then I am afraid, and would gladly be rid of sin. But the law saith, I cannot help thee. . . . Therefore St. John and his testimony or preaching point us to another on whom God the Father has laid our sin, namely, the Lord Christ. The law lays them upon me, but God taketh them away from me, and layeth them upon this Lamb: there they lie well, and better than upon me. And God will say, I see that sin oppresseth thee, and thou oughtest to fall to the ground under the heavy burden; but I will deliver thee from the burden, and will take away sin from thy neck (since the law remitteth thee, thou hast committed the same sins, and therefore condemnest thyself also), and out of pure grace will I lay them upon the neck of this Lamb, which shall bear them." "Wherefore it were well that we should sing, preach, and speak of it continually, praising and glorifying God again for such benefits, that we also might gladly die, and be glad in all manner of affliction. For what is it that the Son of God should become my servant, and so humble himself, that he should also take and bear upon his neck my sorrow and sin, yea, the whole world's sin and death, and say unto me: You are no longer a sinner, but I am; I take your place; you have not sinned, but I have; on me shall all your sins be, and not on you. No man can understand it; we shall see ourselves eternally blessed in the love of God there in that life." We certainly cannot understand that the Son of God humbled Himself so low that He Himself would have done the sins of the whole world, which have been done from Adam to the last man, that He said to me, "You are no longer a sinner, but I am; you have not sinned, but I have. Only in that life shall we fully know it, and see ourselves eternally full and blessed in this love of God. But until then this saying, Isa. 53, 6; Joh. 1, 29, is our only comfort in heaven and on earth, with which alone we can stand in all temptations and deathly troubles.

The later Lutheran dogmatists also make a precise distinction here between guilt and punishment and emphasize: **Christus factus est peccatum pro nobis, non solum ratione poenae, sed imprimis culpae et reatus, eundem in se derivando et ferendo**. And this transfer of our sin, of our guilt, to Christ happened, as they say, **per imputationem realisgimam et per veram appropriationem, liberam susceptionem**. This is as far as we can go here with our words and our words.

but to say and affirm that God has truly and really imputed our iniquity to his Son, and that Christ has really and truly imputed all our iniquity to himself. But this is also sufficient for our comfort and salvation. How God, how Christ has made this possible and brought it about, we can confidently leave to God and Christ.

However, there is one thing we must add to what is included in the concept of guilt and imputation. Guilt reflects in the consciousness of man. Guilt and consciousness of guilt are inseparable. Sin makes one have an evil conscience. And an evil conscience is the worst evil, the bitterest woe. The consciousness of guilt, that the sinner must say to himself: you are the man, you have done this, takes peace and tranquillity from the heart and life. The man who has an evil conscience knows no longer how to let himself go, knows not where to go from one to the other. An evil conscience is torment in hell. The memory of poor Lazarus, whom he had left to die so miserably at his door, the memory of his brothers, in whose damnation he was partly to blame, the voice of Moses and the prophets, which still sounded in his ears and which he had so wickedly despised all his life, was a greater torment to the rich man than the infernal flame. If someone has committed a serious crime, murder, adultery, etc., it is no relief to him if the matter remains hidden, if the punishment, the death penalty, is remitted to him, he has and still retains the blood guilt on his conscience, he must say to himself: It is I, I have done it. Redemption from death, the devil, and hell would not be true, full redemption, if we were not at the same time freed from sin and an evil conscience. But how is it possible for a sinner to be rid of an evil conscience? As long as a man is a man, he is and remains conscious of all that he has done hitherto, whether good or evil. When he looks back over his past life, a long register of guilt always comes before his eyes. No man can eradicate from within him the memory of his evil deeds. And no friend or brother can advise and help the other here. The encouragement and comfort of men cannot appease the conscience that accuses the sinner before God. Matters of conscience are purely personal; a man can settle them only with himself and his God; he cannot entrust them to another. But what is impossible and unthinkable with men is possible with God, God has done it.

God has appointed his servant in our place. We only need to be fully serious about the idea of substitution. **Christus personam omnium peccatorum gessit**, as Luther says. Christ has moved into my place, as it were into my person, and has taken all my personal, internal affairs, my matters of conscience and distresses of conscience from me and made them His own.

made. The Lord cast all our iniquities upon him. God put our sins out of Christ's back, out of his neck. That's what we're talking about. But this is only figurative speech. Sin, guilt, is not an outward burden that lies on a man's body, but weighs on his soul, on his conscience. Our burden of conscience God has taken from us and laid upon Christ, Christ has taken from us and laid upon Himself. Melanchthon, loc. cit. where he describes the sufferings of Christ, throws out the question: **Laboratae conscientia filii Dei**? Did Christ's conscience also suffer? He answers: **Ita; conscientia non sui delicti, sed quia translatum est in eum nostrum peccatum et onus**. And, "Though blameless, yet he hath taken our guilt out of his conscience." Yes, Christ's conscience suffered. He wallowed our sins as his own sins. So also Luther remarks in his interpretation of the 22nd Psalm: **Percussio Dei, qua pro peccatis percutit (Christum), non solum poena mortis est, sed et pavor atque horror perturbatae conscientiae**. Any glance at the history of the Passion will show this. We only remember the Mount of Olives. In Gethsemane Christ passed through a severe struggle of soul. His soul was grieved unto death. He began to tremble and shake, was quite beside Himself ***(αδημονεϊν,*** Mark 14:33). Bloody sweat ran from his countenance. He sent nowhere to rest nor to rest, turned hither, thither, fell down to the ground from his face This is the picture of a man to whom his conscience leaves no rest, to whom the sweat of fear comes out of his brow, who goes with a desponding, terrified conscience towards death and judgment The sin of the world, which lay out of him, has so depressed Jehovah, has put his conscience into fear, anxiety, terror. And now we must not forget who this JEsus was - the very Son of God. Melanchthon speaks of the conscience of the Son of God. God, the great, holy God, before whom the consciences of sinners tremble and are terrified, he became man, took out of himself the sins, distresses, troubles of conscience of men, and trembled and trembled like a poor malefactor. But - God, the Son of God is greater than all the world, and the sin of the world, than the trouble and anguish of our heart and conscience. And so now, when our heart and conscience accuse us, we can quiet it before him, precisely because God is greater than our heart. 1 Joh. 3, 20. The blood of Christ, who through His eternal Spirit offered Himself to God, with which our record of guilt is crossed out, also cleanses our conscience from dead works. Hebr. 9, 14. Luther mentions in his Scholia on Isaias the example of a man who, when reminded of his sin, always said, **Non peccavi, non peccavi,** because one could only have a quiet conscience if he put fine sins far out of sight. But he adds that in reality it is only then that we can put our sins out of sight and obtain a quiet conscience,

if we look not to ourselves, but to Christ. Yes, whoever turns his eye straight to Christ, the Son of God, to the torture of God, to the torture of Christ's conscience, can say with a calm, confident conscience: **Non peccavi**. I have not sinned. It is true that we cannot entirely forget our sin; we remember again and again with pain and sorrow our former misdeeds. But sin has lost its sting. Our sin is in truth no longer sin, because Christ is made sin for us by God. The guilt is taken away, so the reflex of guilt in our conscience is also absent. We sing joyfully, "Sins and anguish of conscience, let us now be content that you have separated us from our God; see how we are united again through God's child. " G. St.

(To be continued.)

## The "condemnation sentences" of the Athanasian Symbolum.

The so-called Athanasian Symbol, which sets forth the doctrine of the Trinity of God and of the person of Christ, introduces this teaching with the words, "He that would be saved must first of all have the right Christian faith. He that keepeth not the same wholly and purely, shall without doubt be eternally lost." And then at the end it is said again, "This is the right Christian faith; whosoever believeth not the same firmly and faithfully cannot be saved." Thus the Confession declares the doctrine of the Trinity, as well as that of the Person of Christ, to be absolutely necessary to salvation. He who does not believe these truths does not have the saving faith. He who does not know them does not have the necessary Christian, beatific knowledge. He who denies them will surely deprive himself of salvation.

All Christendom professes this symbol. Thus all Christendom on earth declares the article of the Trinity to be absolutely necessary for blessedness, and denies blessedness to anyone who does not believe it. The Lutheran Church has also made this confession its own. She confesses in the first article of the Augsburg Confession the doctrine of the Trinity as set forth in the ancient symbols, and also rejects all heresies, ancient and modern, which are contrary to this article. It says of all deniers of this doctrine, "Therefore we freely conclude that all those are idolatrous, blasphemers, and outside the churches of Christ, who hold or teach otherwise." (Apol., Art. I.) She condemns it that "some antitrinitarians reject and condemn the old approved **Symbola, Nicaenum,** and **Athanasianum,** both as to opinion and word," and says of these people, "before whom all pious men are to beware.

Christians want to and should guard, as dear to them is the salvation and blessedness of their souls". (Müller, p. 730.) Accordingly the dogmatists say: "The mystery of the Trinity is necessary to all to know and believe for blessedness. Incompatible with blessedness is not only the denial, but also the ignorance of it. Some things revealed in Scripture are of such a nature that they can remain unknown without prejudice to blessedness, although they cannot be denied without 'danger of it. But with the Trinity, not only denial, but ignorance is condemnable." This is plain, vigorous language on all sides.

And yet, although the Athanasian Symbolum is the official confession of all visible Christendom, yet in the midst of Christendom there has been much offense at it, especially at the so-called sentences of condemnation, since blessedness is made dependent on the acceptance of this doctrine. The displeasure speaks from this sentence, when Kurtz says of the Athanasian Symbolum: "It makes eternal blessedness dependent in the harshest form on the belief in all these propositions." (Krchgsch. 11th ed. I, p. 309.) Stronger language is used by the Herzogsche Realenzyklopädie: "It is also to be observed that in the introduction and conclusion blessedness is already falsely made dependent on the acceptance of a formulated creed." (2nd ed. I, p. 747.) A Unitarian named John Wilson has published a book, entitled: "**Unitarian Principles Confirmed by Trinitarian Testimonies**." In this book he intends to show the made, the unsatisfactory, and the uncertain nature of the doctrine of the Trinity by the half-heartedness or reluctance with which some notable spokesmen of the visible Church confess it, or regret having to confess it. To these people, of course, the Athanasian Symbolum, with its clear, distinct sentences, and especially with its definite condemnation of the opposing false doctrine, is not agreeable. Let us hear a few characteristic of the sayings quoted. One from John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist Church. He says, "I insist on no exposition at all of the doctrine of the Trinity, not even the best I have ever seen: I mean that which is given us in the confession commonly ascribed to Athanasius. It does not even occur to me to say, that he who does not assent to this, will, without doubt, be eternally lost. I dare not insist that anyone should use the expressions 'Trinity' or 'Person'. I myself use them without any hesitation, because I know of no better; but if anyone has any hesitation about them, who will compel him to use them? I cannot, much less would I like to burn a man alive, and with wet green wood at that, because he says, 'Though I believe the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.

Concern to use the expressions 'Trinity' and 'Persons,' because I do not find these words in the Bible. These are the words which the compassionate John Calvin quotes from a letter addressed to him by Servet." (**Sermon 60 in *Works* II,** p. 21.) Further, "Bishop Burnet has said all that can be said, about the sentences of condemnation in the Athanasian Symbolum; but in my opinion it does not miss much. That is why Archbishop Tillotson has said to him frankly, 'The exposition of the Athanasian Creed does not satisfy me at all. I wish we were rid of it with propriety!' And so I wish, to the blessing of our general Christendom. It has been a millstone on the necks of many baptizing noble men. Certainly, such sayings have arisen from the abyss of disgracing the subscribing clergy, of ridiculing the doctrines of the gospel, of driving the world to unbelief, and of damning the souls of those who, for the sake of shameful gain, put their names to what they do not sincerely believe. The fact is, although I believe the doctrine of the Trinity as revealed in Scripture, I am not prepared openly and definitely to send to the devil by my solemn signature anyone who cannot accept the Athanasian exposition of it. May the Lord here forgive his servant for signing it in time past! Most assuredly, I will not do it again." (**David Simpson, *Plea for Religion,*** p. 404.) Then, "I readily admit, that, notwithstanding the reputation of former times, our Church would, in my judgment, have acted wiser, and more in accordance with her general principles of lenity and forbearance, if she had not adopted the condemnatory sentences of the Athanasian Confession. Although I firmly believe that its doctrines are themselves all founded in Scripture, yet I must think it unnecessary and presumptuous to say, 'He who does not hold them firmly and faithfully will, without doubt, be eternally lost.'" (**Bishop Tomline, *Elements of Chr. Theology* II, p.** 222.) One more thing: "I readily admit that blessedness may be attained without knowing the Athanasian Confession. Thousands and millions of Christians have gone to the grave having either never heard of the same, or not understood it. And I add, believe the Scriptures, confess your faith in, Christ in the plain and simple language of the New Testament, and you can then go through life as pious and glad, and can then go to the grave with as calm a conscience, nay, still more, you can then rise as glad and sure of pardon, as if you had descended into the deepest depths of controversy, and pursued the nature of the Deity through the highest summits of metaphysics." (**Dr. Edw. Burton, *Theol. Works* I, p.** 283.) And finally, "By such a proceeding uninspired and fallible men arrogate to themselves an authority.

as it belongs only to God and his inspired messengers; and the confessions, articles, catechisms, and other formularies of a church, or the interpretations, deductions, and assertions of a single theologian, are thus actually substituted for the Holy Scriptures . . . . To wish to decide who shall and who shall not partake of the blessings of the Christian covenant, to prescribe to our fellow-mortals the blind acceptance of our own interpretations as conditions of their blessedness, is a very dreadful presumption on the part of men who do not prove by miraculous works their immediate divine mission." (**Archbishop Whately,** ***Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith,*** **p**. 238.) - There we hear, in the most various keys, people expressing their dissatisfaction with the Athanasian Symbolum, especially with the so-called sentences of condemnation. Each of them asserts that he believes the doctrine of the Trinity from the heart on the basis of Scripture, also believes that the Confession correctly sets forth the doctrine; and yet they declare the old symbol sometimes unnecessary and useless, sometimes a yoke on the necks of disciples, sometimes impertinence, an outrage on Scripture, an arrogation of divine prerogatives, yes, a devil's work, a language from the abyss. One wishes one were rid of it, that the church had never accepted it, indeed one asks God's forgiveness for having signed it before, and vows never to do it again, as no one can sign it with a good conscience.

Whence is it that people get so excited about these two sentences of the Confession? We are not surprised that manifest unbelievers and enemies of Christianity get angry when Christianity claims to want to be accepted in case of loss of blessedness, for this expresses their own condemnation. That people who deny the Trinity do not like to hear such propositions, again we do not wonder at; for thereby they are reproached with denying and rejecting the very thing by which people are blessed, and without which they must be eternally lost. They are put in the same class with the scribes, who shut up the kingdom of heaven from men; they do not enter it, nor let others enter it. Matth. 23, 13. With them the hatred against such exclusive propositions of Christianity simply has its reason in their enmity against Christian truth. But delusion and ignorance also play a great part in this. Such people can often act very foolishly, as if the controversy were about nothing at all, a mere pomposity, a quarrel about the emperor's beard, a sophistry, a quarrel of words of narrow-minded and pugnacious theologians. Such silliness it is when Gibbon makes fun of the fact that sometimes a little change of word order, or a mere disjunctive or copulative particle, can make orthodox or false believers; how little of the word that is considered orthodox can make one orthodox or false?

(Decline and Fall, etc., II., 164.) Now, in addition to the doxology recognized by the faithful, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost," there are three doxologies distinguished as heterodox, namely, "Glory be to the Father through the Son, and in the Holy Ghost;" the other, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, in the Holy Ghost;" and the third, "Glory be to the Father in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost. (***Decline and Fall,* etc.** II, 254.) Now this sort of thing may be stupidity in individual cases, or a feigning of stupidity; but one often has too great a respect for the intellectual greatness of unbelievers. Walch hangs this glory a little lower. He says: "They themselves want to be regarded as subtle and perceptive, and they are also generally thought to have good sense, if one wants to come up with these people and satisfy their objections, in which, however, one sometimes does too much for the matter. A shameful abuse of reason shows no subtle understanding at all." (Introduction to Religionsstreit. anßerh. d. luth. Kirche II, 342.) That one calls himself a reasoner with emphasis, does not prove that he has a special quantum of reason. In the lack of insight and sharpness of mind there is also very often a reason when people who do not want to deny the doctrine, cannot make friends with decisive confession, do not want to reject error. This is why Alonzo Jones, who does not want to be an anti-Trinitarian, cannot find any essential difference between Arius and Athanasius and considers the whole dispute a logomachy. He says: "There was no dispute about whether there was a Trinity, but about the nature of that Trinity. Both parts believed exactly the same Trinity, but they differed as to the exact relation of the Son to the Father." He quotes to Theodoret **in extenso** Arius and Alexander; and in both utterances the difference comes out clearly enough. And yet he goes on to say, "Ans these utterances of the leaders of the two contending parties, it is seen that, with the exception of one point, the two views were identical, only expressed in different ways." And in regard to this one point, he says, they did not understand each other, or even know what they themselves meant. It had been a question of whether the Son was consubstantial or consubstantial with the Father. This, he said, was expressed in Greek by the two shibboleths ***ὁμοοὔσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος;*** the whole dispute was about an iota. "One word has two 'i's, and the other has but one; but why the word should or should not have the one 'i' still, neither party could exactly account for." (***The Two Republics***, p. 333 f.) This is more childish. For some people, the error just doesn't get hard to hide at all. A little pious talk makes everything seem right to them. They are very credulous and weak in discernment. Luther says of Arius:

"He said, that Christ was the most beautiful and glorious creature, not only more noble and more excellent than all visible creatures, than heaven, earth, sun, and moon, but also much higher and more excellent than the angels, through whom God had created them and all other creatures. (VII, 1554.) Simple-minded people then understand these concealing words in their, in the Christian sense, and then do not even hear or see that he expressly called Christ a creature. Channing once says: "We are reproached with denying the deity of Christ. What shall the reproach mean? What are we to understand by the deity of Christ? In the sense in which many Christians, indeed perhaps most, understand it, we do not deny it at all, but believe it as firmly as they do. We firmly believe in the divinity of Christ's mission and ministry, that he spoke with divine authority, and was the bright image of the divine perfections. We believe that God dwelt in him, testified of himself through him, taught men through him, and gave him his Spirit without measure. We believe that Jesus Christ was the most glorious revelation, appearance, and manifestation of God to men, so that when we see and know him, we see and know the invisible Father, so that when Christ came, God visited the world and dwelt among men in a more conspicuous manner than at any previous time. In Christ's words we hear God speak, in His miracles we see God work, in His character and life we see an unsullied image of the purity and love of God. We believe, then, in the deity of Christ, as that word is often and properly used." (***Works***, p. 402.) By such verbiage many a man is beguiled, and then it is no wonder that such people cannot understand that men who speak thus should be dangerous, soul-murdering heretics, and how this can be taken so seriously as to deny blessedness to such people. So apparently Servet beguiled the Wesley with right sounding words. If he really wrote to Calvin what Wesley let him say, then at any rate he wrote more with it, or else Calvin muh have thought he had reason enough not to trust his words, especially since Calvin himself could not get enthusiastic about the received ecclesiastical ways of speaking, but wished they were buried, and one simply believed and taught according to Scripture that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were the one true God.

In the East, however, it is pure **ignorantia affectata to** say that the doctrine is 'much too difficult for the simple-minded,' whether one understands by the simple-minded oneself or others. There one will probably have to take the harsh word of old Dannhauer: "Are highly intoned, but true words in the **Symbolo Athanasii**. O dread^

lich! How will our wilful ignoramuses stand here, to whom the falsely imagined simplicity must be an **asylum**, a shield, and a liberty to defend their ignorance with it? This mystery (if and as much of it has been revealed to us, for God the Lord does not demand more of us) is too high for most, it is relegated from the church to the school as from the fatherland to the **exile;** But the threefold **Sphyngem** (a beast whose face is seen like a virgin, whose feet are shaped like lions' feet along with birds' wings), that is, avarice, lust, and splendor, which are commonly together, to understand, to seek the same, to fall in love with the same, that is not too hard for anyone." (Catechism Milk, 283.)

With others the cause of their offense lies in a confusion of terms. For they cannot distinguish the substance of the biblical doctrine from the common **terms** by which this doctrine is expressed. They understand the Athanasian Symbolum as if it denied blessedness to all those who do not know or understand the ordinary ecclesiastical modes of speaking, or who do not consider them the happiest and most applicable. Now this ought not to be the offence just in the case of the Athanasian Symbolum; for it does not speak in scientific, difficult-to-understand language, does not intend to establish any standard of **termini technici** at all. "It wants to teach the faith of the catholic, that is, general, orthodox Church, and this not both in confessional form, it does not begin with the otherwise constant πιστενομεν**, credimus,** but in short, compendious sentences, to which further instruction was then to follow." (Muller, Einl. ins Konkbch. LII.) But the whole dogmatic apparatus is thereby held in mind by the people, and they think they find its knowledge and acceptance here demanded at the loss of blessedness. Here, I suppose, is a cause of offence to all the people whom we quoted at the beginning, at any rate to Wesley. He assures us that he believes the doctrine of the Trinity on the basis of Scripture; he also names the dogmatic formulas and says that he holds them without hesitation, but that he cannot and will not burn or condemn everyone who does not adopt them. After all, he puts forward the doctrine of the Trinity and wants it believed. He also says that it is necessary to know and believe it for salvation, and that without it there can be no faith and no salvation. He says: "But what I especially believe here is this: the knowledge of the Triune God is interwoven with the whole Christian faith, with all living religion. ... I do not conceive how any one can be a confessor of Christianity until (as John says) he has the testimony in himself, until the Spirit of God testifies to his spirit that he is a child of God, that is, until God the Holy Spirit testifies that God the Father has accepted him through the merit of God the Son; and when he has the testimony, he honors

the Son and the Holy Ghost as well as the Father... . . Therefore I do not see how it is possible for anyone to have living religion who denies that these three are one. And my only hope for them is, not that they may be saved in their unbelief, but that God, before they depart, may bring them to the knowledge of the truth." (Homilies, German v. Nast, II, 372.) Thus, after all, as far as this matter is concerned, he has said the same thing as the **Athanasianum**. However, if the **Athanasianum,** or any confession, or any man, made a man's blessedness dependent on his knowing, understanding, and accepting the common ways of speaking, that would certainly be an abomination. To do so would be to substitute oneself or other men and men's words for God's and His Word, to bind consciences to human ways of speaking, none of which are found in Scripture, to set conditions of blessedness which God does not set. If this were the opinion, then the Lutheran Church would not have accepted either the **Athanasianum** or the ecclesiastical **termini,** and then even today we would not want to know anything about either of them. Then no one would have protested more loudly than Luther, who said quite openly, even in public sermons, that of the ecclesiastical ways of speaking of this doctrine not a single one was beautifully or especially happily chosen, excusing it only by saying, "We have it no better and want to speak uniformly with the church as we believe with it. But the doctrine which finds expression in it he believed from his heart as a Scriptural truth; and because it is so clearly and powerfully set forth in the **Athanasianum,** he esteemed the Confession so highly. Hence the Formula of Concord says of the Antitrinitarians, that they reject the old symbols, "both as to opinion and word" (p. 730). If they had merely objected to the "word," then the Confession would at most have said: this is not nice of them; but now they condemn also the "opinion," thus they depart from Christendom. Rightly understood, it is correct what Seeberg says: "Approval of a dogma does not refer to the scientific technique of its formulation, but denotes approval of the rejection of the opposition against which the dogma is opposed, as well as agreement with the religious tendency for the sake of which that rejection is made." (Grundriß d. Dogmengesch., p. 1.) But behind this also the mischievousness easily hides itself. If one finds fault with the Church's way of speaking, then that is reason enough to look the man over the knuckles. Thus Seeberg describes the genesis of rationalism, how one deceived oneself and others: "One does not want to touch Christ's teaching. One only wants to free it from the strange additions and forms which Rabbinism and Hellenic philosophy have brought into it'. After Paul had already used rabbinical theology around JEsu's simple moral thoughts.

The Gnostics wanted to elevate the Gospel by introducing Platonism. The same path was then followed by the Church, which created dogma, that is, it hellenized the religious ideas of early Christianity with the help of Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophy. Thus theology invented the divinity of Christ and the Trinity. It became more and more 'what we call metaphysics', that is, a 'science of inconsistencies' (Souverän = Löffler). JEsu's thoroughly practical teaching was turned into -empty crickets of metaphysical propositions'. Therefore it is a merit to clear away 'the thorns of school philosophy and monk theology from the religion of JEsu' (Töllner). . . . So one wanted the gospel of JEsu, but one thought of it as essentially identical with the religion of reason. . . . In the name of the gospel, therefore, one protested against the Jewish theology in the New Testament and against the Hellenic dogma of the church." (The Church of Germany in the 19th Century).

With this goes hand in hand the fact that one has no right conception of the nature and task of a confession, that one holds the doctrine of the Holy Trinity not at all for a doctrine of Holy Scripture revealed by God, but for a figment of man's imagination, for a gradual product of the "dogma-forming movement", The dogmatic versions and symbolic fixations indicate the stages of this process, a product of Greek philosophy, an elaboration of the Nicene Council. It is then no wonder that the **Athanasianum,** with its firm, decisive language, its assertoric presentation, which presents the doctrine as finished and only wants to be believed and accepted by everyone, and denies blessedness to those who do not believe it, is not agreeable. He who regards this doctrine as a problem still unsolved and insoluble to this day, naturally considers it madness that he should be expected to stand by the result arrived at in ancient times. Henry Drummond regards the matter as such a problem of human research, which has nothing to do with the Christian religion, and which one can confidently put aside and ignore forever, without prejudice to one's faith and blessedness, for a shorter or longer period of time. He says in a discourse on doubt: "Ask him (the doubter) to set aside, by an effort of his will, all unsolved problems, such as the problem of the origin of evil, the problem of the Trinity, the problem of the relation of the human will and eternal election, etc. - problems on which one has worked for millennia without result. Ask him to put these problems out of his sight as insoluble for the time being, just as one might ask a man who is studying mathematics to put out of his mind the problem of squaring the square.

of the circle. Let him go with what can happen and has happened, and disregard the impossible. It will be found that this frees the doubter's heart from a great baggage that has caused him distress." O yes, the doubter comes to rest, but what is that rest? Silence has been imposed, not upon doubt, but upon divine truth. One has not overcome the vexation of the cross of Christ, but one has nullified the cross of Christ with his wise words, 1 Cor. 1:17. One has made of the doubter a reasoning unbeliever. To such people, of course, the **Athanasianum** can only be annoying and outrageous. - Whoever regards the doctrine of the Trinity as a product of the Nicene Council, it is not to be wondered at, but would be quite in order with his presupposition, that he should be indignant at the fact that, in the event of the loss of their blessedness, Christians should have the sayings of the Fathers and the decisions of the Council laid upon their consciences. Then it would also make sense that the Socinians so often emphasize that the Fathers of the Nicene Council were unlearned men and peasants, and that one points to the tumultuous course of events in the old synods and to the quarrels among the Trinitarians about words and expressions. This, I suppose, is mockingly held up to Christians, and it is said to them, "See, this is how the article came about which is now such a chief article with you, and on which you make blessedness dependent! But all this talk is a slap in the face to us. The doctrine of the Trinity was there long before the Council of Nicaea. It is very clearly stated in the New Testament, and even in the Old. Christianity has had this doctrine at all times. It would also be very easy to prove that the apocryphal Gospels and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the pre-Nicene Fathers in general express and presuppose the doctrine of the Trinity, even if they often express it in an unclear, comprehensible, self-contradictory way. What happened at the Synod of Nicaea was this: that there the doctrine was confessed and formulated to error. What caused the quarrel among the Trinitarians was this: they had to agree and agree on the expressions. This did not go so smoothly. Let us only remember that at Nicaea, for example, the word ***ἁμοούσιος was*** used in an entirely new sense, and made the shibboleth of orthodoxy, which had recently been rejected in another sense as a heretical word, pronouncing Monarchianism. - Even he who finds points of reference for the doctrine of the Trinity everywhere, e. g. in Philo and Plato, and in heathen systems of religion, can hardly hold it to be a divinely revealed doctrine. Thus, for example, Harnack says: "The doctrine of the Trinity has its points of contact in the religious systems of the Orient, in Judaism, in Persian dualism, and in the Platonic-Philonian system." (Signposts in d.

(Church and Dogma History, p. 23) If the doctrine is such a patchwork, then of course it is not understandable why people are not allowed to continue to tinker with it or to reject it completely. Yes, then it is no wonder that one believes to do God a service by cleansing the Gospel of JEsu of such wild outgrowths of Hellenic philosophy, etc. But it stands as Luther says: one is to "learn and know that we have not come into this doctrine by a dream, but have come to it by God's grace through His Word and through the holy apostles and fathers." (XII, 659.) "Such things are not, I say, explored, climbed, or ascended by human reason, but are revealed above from heaven." (XII, 630.) "The articles of faith must not grow on earth by councils, as from new secret inspiration, but be publicly given and revealed from heaven by the Holy Spirit, otherwise they are not articles of faith, as we shall hereafter hear. As this Council of Nicaea (as I have said) did not invent this article, nor establish it anew, that Christ is God, but the Holy Spirit did it, who came openly from heaven upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, and glorified Christ through the Scriptures as a true God, as he had promised the apostles. From the apostles it remained and came to this council, and so evermore unto us, and shall remain unto the end of the world, as he saith: "I am with you even unto the end of the world. And if we had no more to defend this article than this council, we should stand in evil. Nor would I believe the Council itself, but say, They were men. But St. John the Evangelist, and St. Paul, Peter, and the rest of the apostles, these hold fast, and stand for us for good ground and defence, as it is revealed to them by the Holy Ghost, publicly given from heaven, of whom the churches before this council, and the council also of them, had it. For both before the Council, when Arius began, and in the Council and after the Council, they fought hard against the Scriptures, especially against the Gospel of St. John, and disputed sharply, as the books of Athanasius and Hilarius testify. Thus also **Tripartite**, lid. 5, c. 29: 'The faith is established at Nicaea by the Apostles' Scriptures.' Otherwise, where the Holy Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles did, the mere words of the Councilii would create nothing, and their judgment would accomplish nothing." (XVI, 2189 f.) Therefore Gerhard says: "Not from the little books of the Fathers, nor from the filthy puddles of the scholastics, but from the clear sources of Holy Scripture, must and can the mystery of the Trinity be proved. Only those who hold the doctrine to be divinely revealed truth can be so serious about its acceptance and rejection. This conviction the **Athanasianum** presupposes."

In others, their aversion to the vigorous symbolum

their ground in morbid humanity, in soft sentimentalism, which has no sense of seriousness. It is the same morbid trait that stamps the vilest criminal a hero or a poor martyr, sends him flowers to prison, considers the judge hard-hearted and the law cruel. It is indifference to all firm doctrine, aversion to all polemics. After all, one does not want to disturb anyone, let him believe what he likes; and God, the good old Father, makes them all blessed after all, may they have believed more or less or even nothing at all. But truth is exclusive against falsehood. And the church of the living God is "a pillar and foundation of the truth," 1 Tim. 3:15, not a reed which the wind blows to and fro, not a band of people who "learn for ever, and can never come to the knowledge of the truth," 2 Tim. 3:7. It is not Pilati's church, whose saying is, "What is truth?" but Christ's Church, who says, "I was born unto this, and came into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," John 18:37; and, "If ye abide in my sayings, then . . . ye shall know the truth," John 8:31. The Church has God's Word, and "thy word is truth," John 17:17. This is a firm prophetic word, 2 Pet. 1, 19, sharper than any two-edged sword, Heb. 4, 12. The church is to hold fast to the word that is sure, and is to punish the gainsayers, Tit. 1, 9. She is to fight for the faith that was once given to the saints, Jude 3. She shall not only preach the pure doctrine, but also shut the mouths of the gainsayers, Tit. 1, 11. She shall not only say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and then swallow the conclusion, lest the dear unbelievers should be offended, but shall say this equally aloud, "But he that believeth not shall be damned." She is not only to preach the gospel to all creatures unto salvation, but she is also to curse him that preaches another gospel, Gal. 1:8. Yea, he that will not resist error, and cannot suffer polemic, is not himself sure of the truth, is not safe from apostasy, does not take God's word for God's word. Such people are not usually loud. Earnestness for the truth shows itself in the rejection of the contrary. When Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea would subscribe to the Nicene Creed, but not to the condemnatory sentences against Arius, they were justly not trusted. So also Luther says: "Contradict the wanton spirits, otherwise your confession is only a larvae work and of no use. He who holds his doctrine, faith, and confession to be true, right, and certain, cannot stand in the same stall with others who hold false doctrine or are devoted to it, nor can he ever give good words to the devil and his scales. A teacher who is silent about error and yet wants to be a true teacher is worse than a false teacher.

He is a public fanatic, and with his hypocrisy does more harm than a heretic, and is not to be trusted. He is a wolf and a fox, a hireling and a belly servant, and may despise and hand over doctrine, word, faith, sacrament, churches, and schools. He is either secretly in cahoots with the enemy, or is a doubter and a wind-farer, and wants to see where it will end, whether Christ or the devil will prevail, or is altogether uncertain in himself and not worthy to be called a disciple, let alone a teacher, and does not want to anger anyone, nor to speak his word to Christ, nor to do harm to the devil and the world." (XVII, 1180.) It is necessary, as Gerhard says, to present the doctrine not only thetically, but also antithetically. And this is what the **Athanasianum** does. "But if this version of the Symbolum is criticized as being too exclusive, it must be remembered that it is the duty and calling of the Church, as the pillar and foundation of truth (1 Tim. 3:15), to be exclusive against heresy. The question here, as with all symbols, is not whether they leave the desired scope for the arbitrariness and unboundedness which the flesh seeks, but whether they can stand when measured according to the canon of the divine Word." (Müller, Einl. symb. B.)

Or if one still admits that truth and error are not equal, then one thinks that the Symbolum does too much by not only condemning contradiction as error, but by making it out to be damnable, and by denying people eternal blessedness. There could be weak and erring people who would be blessed after all. Such people do not realize the meaning, importance, and scope of this teaching. He who errs through weakness is saved by believing in Christ the Savior. But faith in the Savior is identical with faith in the triune God. He who rejects this article does not deny something out of weakness of understanding, in which faith can exist, but the necessary, actual content of faith. He who does not know it does not have the necessary Christian knowledge. It is not for nothing that faith is not called ignorance, but knowledge. And this doctrine belongs to the **minimum of** knowledge. He who does not know it is in ignorance, which God overlooked, but now teaches all the Gentiles and demands repentance and faith, Acts 17:30. 17:30; for a man may build on the right foundation wood, hay, and stubble, which the fire burns up, and yet he himself may be saved, 1 Corinthians 3:11-15; but there are also men who build not at all, having neither foundation nor building, without this foundation, or building on other foundations; yea, there are men who outline the foundation, Psalms 11:3; but the foundation is faith in Christ the divine Saviour, and so in the triune God. It is well to remember, as the preface to the Book of Concord very carefully emphasizes, that with the **con-.**

**demnationes,** not whole churches are to be condemned which are not pure in doctrine in all things, but "only the false and seductive doctrines and the same stiff-necked teachers and blasphemers". She rejoices to hope and believe that in the erroneous churches there are "many pious, innocent people" who "err out of simplicity, and do not blaspheme the truth of the divine word." And that this and no more is the opinion of her **condemnationes,** she assures "herewith before God Almighty and all Christendom." But there it is a question of doctrines which are disputed between churches; but here is a doctrine without which one is not a church. There it is a question of doctrines, as, for instance, of the Holy Supper, which, of course, are taught plainly enough in Scripture, and are necessary and consoling, the wilful rejection of which, however, condemns, but which a simple-minded, deceived man does not understand, has not purified, and thus deprives himself of a mighty consolation, but yet can hold fast in simple-minded faith in his God and Saviour, be a child of God, and become blessed. But here it is a question of faith in the God and Saviour, without whom there is no childship and no salvation. He who does not know this doctrine is an ignorant heathen; he who rejects it, a despiser of God and his word, "idolatrous, blasphemers," both "outside the churches of Christ," as the Apology says.

But now it is the same with many: they do not recognize the importance of this doctrine for Christianity, because they do not know what Christianity is. Those who think that Christianity is a mere doctrine of virtue cannot see why there should be anything at all in the article, and even so much, if it should exist at all. Thus we have heard Drummond, who is a moral preacher, speak of the article of the Trinity as useless baggage, without which one could quite well become and be a Christian. Unitarians go further: the article is harmful, a hindrance to godliness; one cannot love and honor three to the same degree as one. Moreover, they say, it is the greatest hindrance to missions, because it is so unreasonable that no man will believe it.

Why is the article of the Trinity so important? Because it is inseparably connected with the doctrine of justification. It is part of the very definition of the gospel. As soon as we begin to expound the doctrine of justification, we speak of the Triune God and His work for the salvation of sinners. We cannot tell anyone, even if he is in the last stages, whom we would like to snatch out of the fire as quickly as a fire, what he needs without having named the main moments of the doctrine of the Trinity. Every saying of the Gospel has the doctrine of the Trinity as its premise. When we recite the saying: "So God has

He loved the world by giving His only begotten Son," etc., John 3:16, or: "The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, makes us clean from all sin," 1 John 1:7, then we have spoken of two divine Persons: the Father and the Son, and that of the Son, who is truly the Son of God, God, who accomplishes the divine work of saving a lost world, whose blood makes all clean from all sin. This is why dogmatists say that if you do not know or deny the doctrine of the Trinity, then you do not know or deny the whole economy of salvation. To say: The doctrine of the Trinity is necessary to know and believe for salvation, is nothing else than to say: The Gospel is necessary to know and believe, Christianity is the only true religion; the natural knowledge of God is not enough; that the heathen worship anyone or 'anything as God, does not make them blessed. To say, He that hath not this faith shall be eternally lost, adds to this, "He that believeth not shall be damned," Mark. 16, 16, and, "There is salvation in no other," etc., Apost. 4, 12, add nothing. To condemn the contradiction of this doctrine, is nothing else than to reproach the curse which God's word pronounces on him that preacheth another gospel, Gal. 1:8. For the Christian faith is not this, that one only believes that there is a God who created the world, etc., but this is the gospel: that God out of mercy to a lost world of sinners hath sent his Son to be their Saviour, that the Son of God hath redeemed sinners from sin, death, and the devil, and that the Holy Ghost preacheth this in the gospel, bringeth it to men, keepeth them to believe, worketh faith, and keepeth it. And it is strange that people who take offence at the condemnatory sentences of the **Athanasianum** say quite the same thing in the concrete case! In the sentences against the Deists, "We have a race among us called Deists, which is nothing but a polite term for atheists" (**Traill, Serm**. VI, 1670); "Modern Deism is quite the same as ancient philosophical paganism" (**R. Bentley, Boyle Lecture** IX, 306); "A deist-I mean one who believes that there is a God, distinct from substance, but does not believe the Bible" (**J. Wesley, Works** VII, 196; all three quoted in Zöckler, Geschichte d. Apol. d. Chr.)-in these sentences the same thing is said, after all, as in the Athanasian Symbolum, namely, such people are declared to be unchristians and heathens.

One asks: Why is the knowledge of the three divine persons necessary for salvation? That the knowledge of the Holy Spirit is not so necessary, they say, is clear from Apost. 19, 2. There people are introduced as "disciples" who exclaim in amazement: "We have never heard whether there is a Holy Spirit. Those would have been strange disciples and even more so those from Judaism, if they would have known about the existence of the person of the Holy Spirit.

had not heard anything. They mean the Holy Spirit in the sense, how He came upon them after v. 6, where they spoke with tongues and prophesied, and how it says Joh. 7, 39: "The Holy Spirit was not yet there, because Jesus was not yet glorified", namely the Holy Spirit with His miraculous gifts. Meyer says: "Since the existence of the Holy Spirit cannot have been at all unknown to the men, because they were disciples of John, but the Baptist had pointed with definiteness to the baptism of the Spirit of the Messiah, which would occur after His baptism in water (Mark. 1, 8), also apart from the Old Testament education of the people, according to which they must at least have been aware that the Holy Spirit was something existing, so *&mv* (to accentuate) must necessarily be understood like Joh. 7, 39: '**adest**": 'not even if the Holy Spirit is there (already exists on earth), we have heard". Hence it was still unknown to them whether that which John had proclaimed, namely, that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Spirit, had already happened, and therefore whether the ***πνενμα άγιον*** was there. The additions ***δο& έν, έκχυνόμενον,*** and the like, meet the matter as also Joh. 7, 39, but are entirely dispensable. The version of existence in general has led Olshausen to the dogmatic entry, unseemly here, 'that God was still to them as a rigid, immediate unity, resolved in itself, Vorstand, without knowledge of the proprieties of the Father, Son, and Spirit, necessarily conditioned by the nature of the Spirit,' but in Baumgarten it produces the supposition that they had been heathens." Yes, they would have been pagans, with or without foreskin.

In the case of the Holy Spirit, however, it is not as clear as in the case of the Son that the knowledge of Him as a special divine Person is so absolutely necessary for blessedness. But there is a good reason for this. Every one who desires to be saved must experience the work of the Holy Spirit. He must be converted, called, enlightened, and sanctified; and this is the work of the Holy Spirit. He, the Holy Spirit, bears witness to our spirit that we are the children of God, Rom. 8:16. But the Holy Spirit keeps His person in the background, as it were. He does not transfigure Himself, but Christ, Joh. 16, 14. On the other hand this can be seen very clearly in the second person, the Son. He, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Joh. 10, 36, and whom the Holy Spirit transfigures, whom God places in the center for us, is pushed out of the center by all anti-Trinitarians, His deity is denied, His honor is taken away from Him. It is the deity of Christ that is chiefly at issue in the controversy with the Unitarians. The Trinitarian controversy arose out of the Christological disputes, and in fact consisted in them. The Nicene Symbolum promoted the fixation of the dogma of the Trinity only in so far as it more sharply pronounced the consubstantial deity of Christ. The Athanasian Symbol

Also connects the two doctrines. The Trinity stands or falls with Christ's deity, and vice versa. If God is not triune, but the Father is the only divine person, then of course Christ is not God. But if Christ is not God, and that the true God, God over all, praised forever, then we must not believe in him or worship him either; for that would be idolatry. Among the Socinians there was the party of the Nonadorants, who took their name from the fact that they denied Christ the worship that was not due to him, since he was not true God. Socin himself taught and demanded the worship of JEsu. He called those unworthy of the Christian name, also the Socinian Catechism declares those who do not worship Christ to be un-Christians, since they indeed do not have Christ. Socin complains in a letter: "I do not know what to do with my obstinate followers; they do not want to worship Jesus Christ. I say to them: let all the angels worship him. They answer: However he be, if he be not God, we must not worship him: for it is written: Thou shalt worship God thy Lord, and serve him alone." The Rakau Catechism has the following questions and answers, "What hath the HErr JEsus Christ added to the first commandment? This, that we also should know the HErr JEsum for God, that is, for Him who has divine power over us, and to whom we are bound to give divine honor. Wherein consists this divine honor which we owe to Christ? In this, that as we owe him divine worship, so in all our needs we may implore his help." This judges itself. The nonadorants were in their way in the right: divine honor is due only to God. Only they should have concluded the other way round: because Christ, according to Scripture, is to be worshipped by men and angels, he must also be true God. If Christ is not true God, then we are not redeemed. His blood makes us clean from all sin, only because it is the blood of the Son of God, 1 John 1:8. With the Trinity of God stands and falls Christ's deity and our redemption; for only a divine Saviour can help us anything. "If Christ's Godhead be withdrawn, there is no help nor salvation There Against God's wrath and judgment." (Luther. VII, 1557.) The Deity of Christ was the rod under the earthworm of Christ's humanity, which tore the devil's belly. (1559 f.) "There it sticks, there it lies, there it abides: He that hath not rightly and purely, nor will have this man, who is called JEsus Christ, the Son of God, whom we Christians preach, let him leave the Bible alone, I advise; he will certainly stumble, and the more he studies, the more blind and foolish he will become, be he Jew, Tartar, Turk, Christian, or how he will boast." (Ill, 1882.) "If you look at it in the light and rightly, all heresies fence against the dear article of JEsu Christo. . . . For that which stumbles certainly stumbles against this stone, which lies in every man's way." (X, 1000.) In the

Controversy over this article need not be met with. "Yes, beloved, if the teusel Christum did not want to bite his heels, or had to let it be, it would be easy to have such a quiet, peaceful church.... The heel-biter, the devil, will not rest, nor leave peace to his head-biter; so the head-biter, our Lord, will not suffer such heel-biter." (X, 1003.) The scope of the Trinitarian controversy has been correctly grasped by Sohm, who is not a theologian, but a jurist. He says: "The idea of salvation through Christ, by an act of God (not through us) is the centre of the whole Athanasian theology. The theology of Athanasius, like that of the Apostle Paul, ultimately rests on the thought: not where there is knowledge of the world, but where there is forgiveness of sins, there is life and blessedness. In Athanasius' theology, the Logos-Christ, conceived of in Hellenic terms, who creates the world, takes a back seat to the Logos of the Johannine Gospel, the Son of the living God, who redeems the world. The redemption of the sinful world cannot be accomplished by any being but God Himself, and the Redeemer-Christ must be like God. If God himself were not the source of our redemption, we would all still be under the power of death and in our sins. This desire, not philosophical, but religious, and truly Christian, for a salvation procured by God, is the power of the Athanasian-Nicene doctrine. And by this power it has won the world. The great controversy which was settled by Niceneism was not a mere battle of words, not merely the introduction of another speculative concept (that of homousia) into theology. . . . By placing redemption through Christ at the center of theological thought, the content of Christianity had been scientifically conceived, and yet not Christianity transformed into philosophy, but the eternal, consoling, truly liberating content set in full light, the content which Christianity as religion carries within itself, as the revelation of the deeds of grace which God has accomplished for sinful humanity. In this sense, Niceneism was the rebirth of the Gospel, and therefore it became the firm foundation of all subsequent ecclesiastical development." (Kirchengesch. im Grundriß, p. 47 f.)

The fundamental importance and necessity of the doctrine of the Trinity becomes most apparent to us when we are presented with the theological system of the Unitarians. After saying much against this doctrine, Channing goes on to say, "But the worst is yet to be said." (***Works***, p. 391.) And this "worst" is then just the summa of the Christian gospel. - "Trinitarianism teaches that the infinite Father has thought it good to place the constitution and destiny of all their posterity in the hands of our first parents; and that, by an act of

He teaches that the whole human race, through disobedience, brings into life a depraved nature, or is born in sins. He teaches that the sins of a short life, which, moreover, is begun and spent under this unwholesome influence, deserve endless chastisement, and that God's law threatens this punishment, and that man is thus burdened with a guilt which no suffering of the created universe can expiate, which nothing but the suffering of an infinite being can redeem." (P. 391.) He knows quite well the objection that the denial of Christ takes away the heart of Christianity, and robs the sinner of the comfort of the gospel. Confessors of the Trinity said they had a mighty comfort in the doctrine: they had an infinite salvation. And there he now denies it all. There was no need of redemption at all. Christ's redemption is not an infinite one. Christ was not to redeem, and did not redeem at all. The Father forgives without redemption; and he that saith otherwise dishonoureth the Father, and exalteth Christ unduly.

Redemption isn't even necessary. Sin is not that bad. The sin of finite man in his short life does not deserve endless punishment. "We maintain that man is not created in a state which necessitated infinite redemption." (P. 403.) To be sure, created man is not so; but there is a fall of man. Original sin he denies as a defilement of God. "According to the ancient and genuine way, it is taught that God brings us into existence wholly depraved, so that under the innocent exterior of our infancy there is concealed a nature inclined to all good abundantly all evil, a nature which subjects us to God's displeasure and wrath, even before we have acquired the capacity of understanding our duties or judging our deeds. . . . According to the clearest principles of morality, we maintain that a natural disposition, constantly inclined to evil, and to evil only, would absolve one from blame; that it would be a sign of unspeakable cruelty to bring one into existence under the circumstances, and that it would be an injustice without equal in the most ruthless despotism to punish a child so disposed with endless misery." (P. 377.) To so cruel a God, man would owe no obedience at all, and could not sin against him at all. (P. 396.) "If I believed this, that not the least transgression, not even the first sin of a child's awakening spirit, could be forgiven without an infinite expiation, I should feel as if I lived under a regiment unspeakably more terrible than under Drako's laws written in blood, and instead of thanking the Lord to set up an infinite substitute, I should shrink back from the qualities which make such an escape necessary." (S. 397.)

Christ's redemption had no infinite value at all. Channing

knows precisely only the Nestorian Reformed doctrine of the person of Christ. "When pressed with the question whether they really believe that the infinite and immutable God suffered and died on the cross, they admit that this is not so, that only Christ's human nature endured the sufferings of death. Where then is the infinite redemption?" (P. 375.) "Infinite redemption goes out in pleasure, is a great fraud, ends in - words." (S. 398.)

Unitarians are not clear and do not agree on what Christ's redemption is all about, what it has to do with our forgiveness. But this they agree on, that Christ did not first reconcile and make God gracious. (P. 378.) There is no wrath of God at all. "We will hear nothing of an avenging wrath in God, which must be satisfied by blood, or of a righteousness which binds grace with a chain of iron till its demands are wholly, satisfied." (P. 395.) "How clear, then, it is, that, according to this doctrine, God, instead of being rich in pardon, never pardons; for surely it seems nonsensical to say of men that they are pardoned, when their whole punishment, or something corresponding thereto, has been borne by a substitute." (P. 379.) There, indeed, Christ's honor would be unduly magnified. "Think of a creditor who, out of pity for debtors, persuaded a benevolent rich man to pay in their stead. Would not the debtors see in this a greater grace, and feel a stronger obligation, if they received a free remission for nothing? And would not their chief gratitude stray (**stray** past the creditor to the benevolent substitute? Or think of a father who may not punish a disobedient but weak child, and then persuades a stronger child to bear the punishment. Would not the wrong-doer see a more touching grace in a free pardon flowing directly from a fatherly heart, than in such forgiveness by a roundabout way? And will he not be tempted to cling with his strongest gratitude to Him who has lovingly suffered for him?" (S. 396.)

What then do they teach for a way to salvation? They dream a way past Christ, a forgiveness without redemption, a grace without Christ. "Surely, if we have a Father in heaven of infinite goodness and power, we need no other infinite Person to make us blessed. The common doctrine dishonors and defiles the only true God, our Father, as if, without the help of a second and third person, equal to himself, he could not contrive to make his poor creature, man, blessed." (P. 403.) "Are we asked, as we do well, what then is our hope, if Christ be not the most high God? We answer, It is the infinite and almighty goodness of his Father, and of ours.

Father, a goodness which cannot demand infinite expiation for the sins of a frail and finite creature." (P. 403.) "We give our conception of God in one word: we believe in his fatherly disposition. We ascribe to him not only the name, but the manner and disposition of a father. We believe that he has a fatherly heart for his creatures, a fatherly desire for their correction, a father's equity measuring his demands according to their ability, a father's delight in their progress, a father's willingness to accept the penitent, and a father's justice for the incorrigible." (P. 377.) "I Weih Wohl, that some will say, if I give out an infinite redemption, I deprive myself of all hope of divine grace. To such I would say, You do injustice to God's grace. On this grace I throw myself without fear." (P. 398.) "We are reproached with hoping to be saved by works, and not by grace. This reproach can be easily dismissed, and a more unfounded one cannot be easily conceived. We, however, magnify Christian works, Christian obedience, and believe that a walk according to the commandments and after the example of JEsu is the great end for which faith in him is necessary, and that it is the condition upon which eternal life is given. We are accustomed to speak highly of the virtues and progress of a true Christian, and indignantly reject the notion that they are no better than the outward Jewish righteousness, which the prophet calls an obscene garment, and hold with the apostle that they are of great value in God's sight. . . . But we always and earnestly maintain that no human virtue, no human obedience, can give a legal right, a right nor merit, to the life and immortality brought to light by Christ. We see and lament our imperfections, unrestrained resolutions, and mixed motives in the best of men. We always emphasize that God's grace, goodness, free kindness is still needed by the most advanced Christians, and that to this alone we owe the promise given in the gospel of full pardon and eternal blessedness to the penitent. No one talks more about grace than we do. It is one of our peculiarities that we magnify this lovely attribute of the Godhead. So accustomed are we to dwell on God's infinite grace and mercy, that our adversaries often reproach us with forgetting his justice. And yet we are accused of despising grace, of insisting on our righteousness, and of building our hope on the perfection of our merit." (P. 404.) But the grace which is so much spoken of is not grace in the Scriptural sense, not that which is acquired through Christ, the grace of God in Christ. In a church sermon it is emphatically said, " We

consecrate them to the praise of his free, unpurchased, and unearned grace." (S. 401.)

Thus speak and must men speak who reject the Trinity. What has fallen and had to fall with this teaching! Yes, what is left of Christianity, of the law, and of the gospel? Christ's glory as God and Saviour has been taken away, the sinner has been spared the earnestness of repentance, and the consolation of Christ has been robbed; with all the insistence on "grace," Pharisaism has been exalted, and the Holy Spirit and His work have been entirely silent. The denial of the Trinity entails the whole gospel. To say that this doctrine is unnecessary is simply to say that Christianity differs in nothing essential from other "religions," that Christ's bitter agony was needless expense, that missions are unnecessary, that there is no purpose in preaching the gospel to all creatures, that it is quite sufficient to spread the lodge religion throughout the world. Such a "theology" is exactly of the same ilk as Erasmus' "form of Christianity," since he also says: only this is necessary, "that we should exert ourselves with all our strength, resort to the means of repentance, seek to obtain God's mercy in every way, without which neither human will nor effort can do anything. ... Let no one despair of forgiveness from God, who by his nature is exceedingly gracious." To this Luther makes the remark: "These words of yours are without Christ, without the Holy Spirit, even colder than ice." "There is not even anything left of Judaism, much less of Christianity." (XVIII, 1685.)

Open language is used by the so-called free Protestants. They make no effort at all to deal with the Bible. To them, decidedly, the Bible counts as much and as little as any other book of religion. The Free Protestant Catechism of Thomas places paganism and the idolatry of the heathen as equal to Christianity and the service of the God of the Bible. He makes God say of the heathen, "They meant me only, and no other; and though they knew it not, yet it was the intention." (p. 21.) He teaches the little song, "We all believe in one God, and to him we pledge allegiance. Each one call him according to his way, little is the price of all words, only deeds can praise him." (P. 68.) He says, "It matters not whether we believe false or true. For errors stultify, though they do not condemn." (p. 19.) And on the same page, "It matters less what we believe than how we believe. That we are right believers is important; whether we are right believers, very indifferent. It is not the content of faith that is the main thing, but the sense of faith. Opinions do not make the Christian, the mind makes him." He gives the characteristics of his "church:" "Of all orthodox churches the Free Protestant Ge-

The churches are different in that they do not require any particular confession of faith from their members. Unitarians and Trinitarians, Lutherans and Calvinists, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, unbelievers and superstitious are welcome, if they only wish to build themselves up Christianly and to live Christianly. (p. 100.) That is all that can be said.

It is certainly true what Luther says of the article of the Trinity: "Where one is not rightly instructed and founded in this, the others also cannot be acted upon purely nor fruitfully." (XII, 646.) "In Christianity God has revealed Himself as the Triune God, that is, as the God who reconciles apostate humanity to Himself. Hence faith in the triune God, as inwardly one with faith in the atonement, is sole-salvific." (Hare, **Hutterus redivv**., p. 162.) Hence Luther esteems the Athanasian Symbolum so highly that he writes: "I do not know whether the Church of the New Testament has a more important Scripture after the time of the Apostles." (VI, 1576.) Hence the enemy has ever and ever raged against this doctrine in the most manifold ways, falsifying it, denying it, or casting it aside. Carpzov, in a disputation **De Mysterio Trinitatis, says**: "It is strange and peculiar that, according to Pliny, serpents never show themselves on a trefoil (**trifolium**). But nowhere did the infernal serpent show its venom more than on the sacred trefoil, that is, on the doctrine of the three persons in the Godhead." The first will probably be superstition; but the second experience teaches. E. P.

## Literature.

Published **by Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. synodal report of the Eastern District with the continuation of the paper by P. W. Bröcker on the subject: "Paul, the Apostle JEsu Christi." (12 Cts.) 2. "Statistical Year Book" of the Missouri Synod for the year 1909, from which the principal data are given in the contemporary history. (40 Cts.) 3. "**Lutheranism in America: Its Glory and Its Mission." By W. *H. T. Dau***. (3 Cts., the dozen 30 Cts., the hundred H2.00.) This excellent address was delivered at the Common Reformation Celebration in New york, October 31, 1909, and we now commend it to our pastors for wide circulation among the people. ' F. B.

**Anthology of characteristic preludes** to the most common chorales of the Lutheran Church. Issue 1. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo.

This great work of its kind will be published in three issues: "Issue H. 13 issues of about 48 pages each. About two issues or a double issue sent postage paid every month. Price: $1O.OO. Issue 6. 13 issues, as in Issue H, but in two **Flexible Pebble Cloth-covered bindings**, delivered by August 1, 1910. Price: $12.00 postage prepaid. Issue s. As in issue c, but in the best **Seal-Grain leather binding**. Price: $13.50 postage paid." The first issue offers 57 preludes from 48 pages. The **Concordia Publishing House**

says of this anthology, "This collection of preludes will comprise about 624 pages of neat lithography, each plate about 10½X7½ inches of music engraving on a sheet area of about 14X11 inches, that is, the size of American **'sheet music,'** only in landscape instead of portrait format. There are nearly 700 preludes, some easy, others less so, and only a few difficult to perform for organists of average talent and skill, but there are always several preludes to the most frequently used chorales. All the pieces have a churchly character, indeed they bear a distinctly Lutheran stamp, without exposing themselves to the accusation of pedantry. Most of them are short, that is, short enough not to lose the essential quality of a prelude, but a few festive preludes are long enough to deserve the name festvorspiel. Most are taken from the works of tried masters of ecclesiastical organ music, but pleasing samples of recent American Lutheran composers were confidently allowed to be included; for we need by no means be ashamed of the achievements of our more distinguished composers." - Every congregation should purchase this noble and rich work for its organist. F. B.

History of the Minnesota Synod and its several congregations. A Commemorative of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Synod, 1860-1910. printed by the **Louis Lange Publishing Company**, St. Louis, Mo. price: $1.00. Orders should be addressed to **Rev. J. Schulze, Stillwater, Minn**.

From the first 50 pages of this book, A. Kuhn, Sr. gives a brief history of the Minnesota Synod itself, which was initially part of the General Synod, then the General Council, and was recognized as an orthodox synod by the Wisconsin Synod in 1871 after previous negotiations. The following pages (51 to 286) provide a brief history of each congregation. Attached throughout are pictures of pastors, professors, institutions, churches, etc. In the section on the Grace Election Controversy, p. 34, it says: "This doctrinal controversy also agitated our Synod, as views were divided on the doctrine set forth. It was not until the detailed treatment of the doctrine at the Community Synod at La Crosse in 1882 that clarity was brought and the decision reached. With the exception of Pastors Siegrist, Vollmer, and Kittel, a portion of the congregation at Stillwater, and the congregation at Springfield, Minnesota, which separated, the Synod agreed with the doctrine that Article 11 of the Formula of Concord was not at all about election by grace in the broader sense, but about election in the narrower sense, which is, based on the general council of grace, is a cause of faith and therefore of the filiation of those on whom it has been decreed from eternity, and by which God has taken the perseverance in faith and therefore also the blessedness of his elect into his hand in such a way that they can and should be certain of their blessedness in spite of the devil, the world, and the flesh; and that we are in agreement with persons and ecclesiastical bodies who have such an understanding of the 11th article of the Formula of Concord. Article of the Formula of Concord to us and others as false doctrine, as long as they do not honestly recant, we will not maintain synodal, possibly church fellowship. Church fellowship. After the withdrawal of the above-mentioned pastors and congregations, doctrinal unity was restored among us, and we had the advantage of the doctrinal struggle that from now on we had a watchful eye on synergism, which was the real cause of this doctrinal dispute. Attempts were later made to reach agreement with the opponents out of free conferences, but as yet they have not succeeded, and so the friction continues, causing confusion here and there. " F. B.

The Christian morality after Luther. By D. Wilh. Walther in Rostock. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 2.80; paperback: M. 3.

D. Walther von Rostock has already delivered several excellent apologetic works about Luther. In this monograph of 137 pages, he sets forth in a clear, sharp manner what Luther teaches about Christian morality, and at the same time, he vehemently rejects the attacks that papists, pietists, and modern 12

Theologians, such as Ritschl, Loofs, Kaftan and others, have made on Luther's doctrine of morality. In fine concluding remarks Walther says: "This very divorce" (of faith and morality) "he (Luther) does not know. And he is the only one who does not know it. Therefore he is the only one in whom the whole of Christianity has become a real unity." Luther, Walther rightly says, had grasped true morality in its full and pure glory, and had utterly rejected all conceivable selfish motives. He demanded all individual action as free activity of love springing from within, and showed Christians the right way in which they might be steadily brought nearer to true morality. According to Luther, faith is the source of true morality, and the strengthening and increase of faith is therefore the only way to increase true morality. - Walther's writing is divided into the following sections: "1. true morality. (2) The source of true morality, or the importance of faith for morality. 3. The empirical morality of the believing Christian. 4th The necessity of morality, or the importance of morality to faith." Two pronouncements of Walther may follow verbatim: on repentance and self-love. On Luther's doctrine of repentance Walther says p. 19: "In contrast to Catholic repentance, which is a 'sorrow assumed on account of sin,' or 'awakened' by man, he has called 'right repentance,' 'when truly thy conscience begins to bite thee and to fear thee, and thy heart is sincerely terrified at God's wrath and judgment' on account of sin, 'so that thou hast incurred God's wrath upon thee, and hast deserved that thou, being eternally rejected from his sight, shouldest burn in hellish fire.' He adds: 'Such repentance and serious fright does not come from one's own human hearing and thought, as the monks dream of it, but must be wrought in the man by God's word, which indicates God's wrath and strikes the heart so that it begins to tremble and tremble and does not know where to stay.' 'Now this is the thunderbolt of God, so that he strikes both manifest sinners and false saints into one heap and leaves none right, drives them all into fright and despondency. This is not **activa contritio**, a made repentance, but **passiva contritio**, the right heartache, suffering, and feeling of death." If, according to this, -true repentance begins with the fear of God and judgment,' how then can Luther declare everything that does not proceed from love of God to be sin? It is precisely what Luther goes on to teach about 'right repentance' that can help us solve this whole difficulty. For with the same definiteness with which he demands this fear of God's judgment, he also asserts that this is not true Christian repentance, that is, not Christian morality." P. 35 ff: "But ought not a third love, namely, self-love, to be prescribed by the addition of the provision that we should love our neighbor 'as ourselves'? Thus it had probably been taught before Luther. But he rejects this: 'I understand this commandment in such a way that self-love is not commanded, but only love of neighbor.' For self-love need not first be commanded, and if it were commanded here, it would be said, 'Love thyself, and love thy neighbor as thyself.' But it is said, 'Love thy neighbor as thou lovest thyself already without command.' So in the words 'as thyself' the best example of charity is prescribed, such as we feel in ourselves, which teaches us most powerfully." At times, however, we are unable to agree with Walther's remarks as they read, e. g., p. 51, where it is not merely said that the very first flash of faith implies love to God, but also: "But logically the beginning of love to God may be distinguished as the primary thing from the beginning of faith." The trust of the first commandment is here confused with justifying faith.

F. B.

**THEOLOGIA DEUTSCH**. Edited by **Lic.** Herm. Mandel. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M.2.60.

This work treats in the introduction (XLVI pages) 1. Luther's editions and evaluation of the Theologia Deutsch; 2. the other editions since 1518; 3. the origin of the Theologia Deutsch; 4. the train of thought of the same; 5. the evaluation of the same in history; 6. introduction to the German Theo-

logst and appreciation of the same. Then follows on 114 pages with numerous annotations the text of the "**Theologia Deutsch**" itself, which is also in linguistic and orthographic respect an exact reprint of the second edition, organized by Luther in 1518, which according to Ido. Mandel, is closer to the original text than any other. In the preface to the edition of 1518, Luther praises the "**Theologia Deutsch**": "Besides the Biblien and St. Augustino, there is not a single book from which I have learned more about God, Christ, man and all things. Um. Mandel judges, "That Luther later turned away from the '**Theologia Deutsch**' is an unproven assertion." But this does not reconcile with the fact that the doctrine of justification, as Luther drives it in all his later writings, is not found in the "**Theologia Deutsch,**" Um. Mandel himself must admit: "But in the understanding of the significance of Christ for justification the '**Theologia Deutsch**' falls short of its student Luther. It knows nothing of reconciliation and of the enduring value of Christ as the object of basic religious conduct. It does not go beyond an exemplarity - admittedly more deeply grasped than usual." Nor did Luther, as Um. Mandel supposes, the mystical, pantheiftically-inclined monism which underlies the "**Theologia Deutsch.**" To give the reader an idea of the language and orthography of Luther's edition of the "**Theologia Deutsch,**" we will let follow a brief sample in which the question is answered, "Why got den eigen willen geschaffen hab, wenn er im als wider ist?" The passage reads, as follows: "**Now it may be asked, if this tree, which is his own will, be contrary to God and his eternal will, why then hath God created and made it, and set it in paradise? Answer: Which man or creature desireth to know and to know the secret counsel and will of God, that he might know why God doeth or leaveth this or that, and the like, he desireth no other than Adam and the devil. And all these things, because they are worthy to be sinned against, are known more clearly, and man is no other than Adam or the devil. Wherefore this foundation is rare, and not for any other reason, than that a man may delight and glory in it, and that is hoped for. A good, humble, enlightened man does not understand about God that he reveals his secrecy to him, so that he asks why God does or does not do this or that and the same, but he understands how he alone becomes null and void in himself and how the eternal will in him is alive and powerful and uninhibited by other wills, and how enough happens to the eternal will of and in him**.

**The Doctrine of Justification in the Apology**. By D. Johannes Kunze. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 80 Pf.

This booklet of 43 pages deals primarily with the concept of justification in the Apology. The author seeks to prove that the Apology, in contrast to and following the Roman doctrine, states that man is justified by faith alone, both in the first reception of the forgiveness of sins and in justification throughout life. The first reception of the forgiveness of sins, according to D. Kunze, the Apology constantly designates with the expression, "**ex injusto justum effici seu regenerari,**" and the second with the words, "**justos pronuntiari seu reputari.**" Kunze also holds that the Latin text in §72 (a **crux interpretum**) is corrupt, and should thus read, "**Et quia justificari significat ex injustis justos effici seu regenerari, et justos pronuntiari seu reputari (utroque enim modo loquitur scriptura**), ideo **primum volumus hoc ostendere, quod sola fides ex injusto justum efficiat, hoc est, accipiat remissionem peccatorum.**" Thus the German text also agrees. The second proof, that faith alone **justifies** throughout life (**justos pronuntiari seu reputari**), that is, even after the person has already received the first forgiveness, begins, according to D. Kunze, with § 86, without this being particularly indicated. In order to maintain his view, D. Kunze is again forced to propose the following wording for § 86: "**Quum autem sola**

**sanctum, sola fides justificat. Sola fides autem justificat etiam ideo, quia reconciliati reputantur justi et filii Dei, non propter suam munditiem, sed per misericordiam propter Christum, si tamen hanc misericordiam fide apprehendant. Ideoqfie scriptura testatur, quod fide justi reputemur." ©nblip ftalt D. ilunge aup bafiir, baft ber abfplieftenbe § 117 alfo tauten foUte: "Hactenus satis copiose ostendimus et testimoniis scripturae et argumentis ex scriptura sumptis, ut res magis - fieret perspicua, quod sola fide consequimur remissionem peccatorum propter Christum, hoc est, ex injustis justi efficiamur seu regeneremur, et quod Sola fide justificemur (hoc est, coram Deo justi reputemur)**." We cannot here enter into the further reasoning which D. Kunze gives for his interpretations and corrections. He concludes his treatise with the words: "From what has been said it follows that for the Positive Exposition of the Lutheran doctrine of justification only the formula **justificari** in the sense Von **coram Deo justos reputari**, that is, **consequi remissionem peccatorum, comes into** consideration, that the paraphrase **ex injustis justos effici** has only apologetic-polemical significance, hence for us only historical interest, but that a mere **justum effici has** never been at all a, much less the specific formula for the Reformation doctrine of justification." F. B.

**Paulus Gerhardt's Spiritual Songs**. Pon Philipp Wackernagel.
Newly edited and published by W. Tümpel. Ninth edition. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: M. 3.

According to Tümpel, the present edition offers "the original text of Gerhardt's songs, based on the results of research up to the present day, but without all scholarly accessories". In addition to Gerhardt's 131 songs, this 479-page volume contains a brief biography of Gerhardt, information about the collections and editions of Gerhardt's songs, and a list of words and phrases that require explanation. Of Gerhardt's attitude to the Uniate impositions of the Elector Friedrich Wilhelm it is said: "Paulus Gerhardt appears in the course of the whole negotiations as the loudest character; he was the soul, I would like to say the good conscience of the Berlin clergy. He was guided neither by obstinacy nor passion." Concerning the famous words in Gerhardt's Testament, "Study the Holy Theologiam in pure schools and from unadulterated universities, and, indeed, beware of syncretists, for they seek the temporal and are faithful neither to God nor man," it is aptly remarked, "These words, uttered in the face of death, after such a life, were an earnest, holy legacy for the Son, since their promulgation also for the whole Protestant Church." We add: "insonderheit in unserer Zeit," in which, for example, there is not a single university left in Germany where the old Lutheran doctrine of the inspiration and infallibility of Holy Scripture, the principle of all theology, is still held. F. B.

The Holy Land in the Mirror of World History. By A. Lüttke.
With 12 illustrations and 3 maps. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: M. 6; hardback: M. 7.

This volume of 568 pages presents in 43 sections the history that has taken place in Palestine, from the most ancient times to the present. The main purpose of the author is to place the biblical history in the context of the history of the world, which, however, puts many of the facts reported in the Bible in a bright and vivid light. In the preface it says: "The author has endeavored to offer the most assured results of research possible; to go into scientific hypotheses is avoided, because it does not correspond to the purpose of the book. ... The author has attached importance to making the mutual relations between the history of Palestine and the general history of the world in all epochs as clear as possible. . . . Furthermore, the author has considered it important not only to describe the outward course of historical events, but at the same time to portray the spiritual life of the individual epochs, also in its interaction with the

general spiritual currents, which influence the time in each case." In this presentation, however, the biblical stories themselves with their truths are often faded. The reason for this, however, is not the background of world history, which the author knows how to portray excellently, but the author's lax, liberal theological position on the Holy Scriptures and their revelatory truths and facts. F. B.

Kirchliches Jahrbuch 1909 (Church Yearbook 1909): A book on church studies of the present. Edited in connection with others by Rev. J. Schneider. Volume 36. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: M. 5; hardcover: M. 6.

This volume of 638 pages offers a wealth of information on all Protestant churches and synods in Germany. The material is presented in the following chapters: "1. Ecclesiastical Structure of Protestant Germany and Personnel Status of Protestant Church Authorities and Synods. (pp. 1-49.) 2. Decisions of the highest courts, so far as they affect the ecclesiastical versafs and practical congregational life. (pp. 50-100.) 3. Mission to the Gentiles. (pp. 101-171.) 4. Mission to the Jews. (pp. 172-185.) 5. Evangelism and the condition of the evangelical church in the foreign diaspora. (pp. 186-225.) 6. Jnnerchurch evangelism of the community people. (pp. 226-252.) 7. Church statistics. (pp. 253-408.) 8. Associations. (pp. 409-471.) 9. Inner mission. (pp. 472-575.) 10. ecclesiastical-social chronicle. (pp. 576-590.) 11. Ecclesiastical conferences and congresses. (pp. 591-628.) 12. review of the dead. (S. 629-634.) 13th Supplements. (S. 635-636.)" The appraisal and judgment of the various ecclesiastical bodies, institutions, and endeavors is naturally directed to the ecclesiastical and theological position of the performers, which is essentially the Uniate. The following passage on our work in Brazil (p. 462) shows how the judgment can turn out: "The Missourians are invading from North America, endowed with rich financial means, in order to form North American Missourian communities in place of the German Protestant congregations in an unbrotherly, hateful manner, and in this way to sever the ties which have hitherto bound the large German settlements in Mo Grande do Sul to the old homeland of Germany." On page 44, the Hermannsburg Free Church, which has been united with the Free Church of Saxony and other states for several years, is still listed as an independent synod.

F. B.

Selection from the works of the Wandsbeck messenger Matthias Claudius. Edited and provided with a biography by K. Trompetter. With 10 illustrations. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 1.60.

Claudius says: "To drink wine or water at all times is not funny, but to drink wine and water at times is funny; so it is also funny to read various things. And to those who wish to indulge in a wholesome enjoyment in our time of over-culture, we recommend the reading of this pithy, sober, genuinely German and pious poet Claudius. Everywhere in nature he sees the finger of God. "Him (the Creator) the heavens and earth preach, and bodies and appearances in visible nature are little bells on the ephod, betraying him and his walk." He preaches happiness in the family: "I am very much in favor of having one's joy in all things at home, not seeking it abroad." He preferred the positive faith of the Bible to the friendship of a Goethe, Herder, and Voß, and even the alienation and ridicule of these his former friends failed to mislead him in his Christian faith. With earnestness and satire, on the contrary, he turns against the enlighteners of his time, and even on the French revolutionary social ideas he passes the right judgment. "It is in man," he says, "and not in institutions. Man must be improved, and, I would advise, not brought in from without. One does not turn the hand so that the work in the clock may go right, but one improves the work in the clock so that the hand may go right. In the same way, I would not like to turn the hand of a human being, but to improve the inside of the watch.

have improved what is necessary, so that everything on the dial makes itself. Claudius considered it his task in his "Wandsbecker Boten" to stand up for the "old apostolic Christianity" in the face of rationalism and especially to show "by the **factum**" that one need not be completely ignorant and without all common sense in order to be an orthodox Christian. F. B.

**COUNTRY SERMONS.** ***New Series.*** **Vol. V. Sermons on Free Texts for the Entire Church-Year. By** ***Rev. F. Kuegele.*** **Augusta Publishing Co, Crimora, Va.** Price: $2.25.

This volume of 640 pages, bound in cloth, is a revised and enlarged edition of the first two volumes of the old series of "**Country Sermons**". We are glad that these sermons, which are as simple and clear as they are solid, have found such a ready market that a new edition (of the first part already the third) has become necessary. There are 68 sermons on free, puffing texts for all Sundays and feast days of the whole church year. Also for the harvest, mission and reformation feasts, as well as for the day of thanksgiving, one sermon each is offered. This book is available from **Concordia Publishing House**. F. B.

**THE CRIME OF THE CONGO. By** ***A. Conan Doyle.*** **Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.**

King Leopold of Belgium, who died last year, was celebrated and honored after his death as a faithful son of the Church not only by the Roman hierarchy in Belgium, but also by the Pope himself and many other Roman dignitaries in other countries, and in the United States especially by Gibbons and Ireland. In Washington, Leopold was honored by a requiem mass attended by President Taft. And all this in the face of the world-renowned fact that Leopold was as lecherous a monarch as he was cruel. The above book brings from Protestant and Papist sources the detailed evidence of the innumerable, longstanding, inhuman cruelties against the natives of Congo State with which King Leopold and his accomplices sought to enrich themselves. In the preface the author says: "**There have been massacres of populations like that of the South Americans by the Spaniards or of subject nations by the Turks. But never before has there been such a mixture of wholesale expropriation and wholesale massacre, all done under an odious guise of philanthropy and with the lowest commercial motives as a reason. It is this sordid cause and the unctious hypocrisy which makes this crime unparalleled in its horror. The witnesses of the crime are of all nations, and there is no possibility of error concerning facts. ... A perusal of all of these sources of information will show that there is not a grotesque, obscene, or ferocious torture which human ingenuity could invent which has not been used against these harmless and helpless people.**" And to these atrocities the Roman missionaries in the Congo were silent. This now explains why the Romanists celebrate King Leopold and deny the atrocities in the Congo. Jreland boldly asserts, "There were no atrocities in the Congo." If the Romanists wanted to condemn Leopold, they would be passing judgment on their own church. According to Dohle, in the Belgian Chamber the Catholic Colfs said, "Our missionaries have less freedom than the foreign missionaries. They are expected to remain silent. ... There is a gag. This gag is put in the mouths of the Belgian missionaries." F. B.

The General Council Publication Board sent us:

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

According to the recently published "Statistical Yearbook", at the end of the previous year, 1910, our Synod counted pastors in office, to which, however, must be added a number of professors and pastors who were ill, emeritus, and out of office, so that the total number of pastors and professors was 2153. 2661 congregations, of which 1454 were members of the Synod, and 943 preaching places were served by our pastors (and some professors). The number of souls amounted to 867,262, the number of those entitled to communion to 521,130, the number of those entitled to vote to 121,423, the number of schools to 2123, in which, besides 1109 pastors, who had to serve both offices, 1009 teachers and 222 female teachers worked, and which were attended by 95,024 children. 33,233 children were baptized, 23,104 confirmed, 9994 couples copulated, 11,346 persons buried, and 928,418 communicated. Increased were pastors, 54; congregations belonging to the synod, 62 (the number of non-synodical congregations remaining unchanged); preaching places, 13; souls, 12,537; communicants, 10,628; voters, 1850; schools, 15; school-keeping pastors, 2; teachers, 25; communicants, 1363; copulations, 820. The following headings show a decrease: Teachers, 7; school children, 1011; baptized, 776; confirmed, 28; buried, 62. In the service of the Inner Mission were 424 pastors, 41 teachers, and 42 students, who served 1225 congregations and preaching places, of which, for example, 121 are in northwestern Canada. There were 7 pastors in the Deaf and Dumb Mission, preaching in 38 places. Independent congregations exist in 8 places. In the foreign-language missions of this country, embracing the Estonian, Latvian, Polish, and Lithuanian missions, there are 6 missionaries working in 45 places. Two papers, an Estonian and a Latvian, are published for the promotion of the two former missions. Through the Emigrant Mission in New York and Baltimore, about 800 emigrants were assisted in word and deed. The number of guests in the Pilgrims' Home in New York was 3445, 1983 Germans and 1462 Scandinavians. One missionary each was active in the Jewish and Indian missions. The latter numbered 147 souls; in the former the average number of listeners was 50, and about 75 children attended the Saturday and Sunday school. The heathen mission to India numbered 9 missionary workers, 173 native Christians, 21 schools, and 878 school children. The largest number of Hindu Christians is in the newest ward, Nagercoil (112), and the highest number of pupils is in Ambur (352). The Negro Mission, operated by the Synodical Conference, numbered 30 congregations and preaching places (19 in North Carolina, 6 in Louisiana, and 1 each in Virginia, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, and Illinois), and 39 persons were employed in it: 13 white pastors and professors, 6 colored pastors, 8 whites and 5 colored teachers, 3 colored teachers, and 4 students on temporary duty. Number of souls: 2067; communicants: 858; voters: 242; pupils in weekly schools: 1403, in Sunday schools: 959. The "Missionary Dove" has 23,854, the

***Pioneer*** 5500 subscribers. The frequency of the Synod's 10 full high schools and 4 progymnasia amounted to 1762 students (including 500 in the two theological seminaries), taught by 76 professors and 11 assistant teachers. There are also 4 high schools within the Synod (one maintained jointly with the Norwegians) and a **Lutheran Education Society** "for the cultivation of higher Christian education in the Atlantic District" (membership 289). In the two institutions of the Negro Mission 98 pupils studied, and the number of professors was 6. 25 charitable institutions (orphanages, hospitals, old people's homes, one institution for the deaf and dumb, one sanitarium for lung patients, and one institution for the feeble-minded and epileptic) are maintained by private societies. There were about 700 children in the orphanages. There were 12 Children's Friendship Societies in the area of the Synod, of which seven, which sent in a complete report, placed a total of 257 homeless children in Lutheran families for care or adoption during the past year. In Chicago there is also a children's home, in which the children referred to the City Missionary Society there by the Juvenile Court for temporary care are admitted. During the past year, 76 churches (21 in the Minnesota and Dakota Districts) and 16 schools were dedicated. Supported 60 sick and emeritus pastors and teachers and 303 pastors' and teachers' widows and orphans; expenditure: $33,954.34. Died 14 pastors (452 since the Synod was organized) and 10 teachers (221 since the Synod was organized). An average of 90 men were employed in the **Concordia Publishing House**, the book and publication business of the Synod body, which yielded a net profit of $100,000 for the Synod treasury. In bequests $36,958.12 was received; the various missions received from the benefactors concerned $817,102.71 (the church building fund received from the late S. M. Becker, of Pittsbusig, Pa, nearly $12,000), the teaching institutions and students 82297.04, and the charities in the synodical district 817,558.37. On the whole ^the following sums were received for extra-parochial purposes: $42,230.52 for the synodical treasury, $131,615.58 for the synodical building treasury ($72,461.78 from the Atlantic District alone for the college at Bronxville, N. U.), $34,196.85 for the Widows and Orphans Fund, $1901.96 for afflicted churches and individuals, 85740.99 for European Free Churches, $40,447.58 for students, $7141.17 for the budget of teaching institutions, 8112,914.86 for charitable institutions, $134,775.32 for internal mission, 810,070.31 for city mission, 823,890.25 for church building fund, $18,248.52 for mission to Brazil, 81848.18 for mission to Australia and New Zealand, $15,773.31 for heathen mission, $23,061.63 for negro mission, 87407.63 for Indian mission, $1728.88 for Jewish Mission, $10,183.48 for Deaf and Dumb Mission, $4074.52 for Foreign Language Missions in this country, and 81774.99 for Emigrant Mission (at the Mission Fairs $90,136.23 was raised for the various missions); Total: $628,925.15, an increase of $185,719.89 over the previous year. R.

**Union services between Ohioans, Conciliarists, and General Synodists**. The Ohio "Church Journal" writes (p. 202), "The Pittsburgh 'Pre-Lenten Services'. The ***Lutheran of*** the General Council reports a series of meetings held at the beginning of Lent in

Pittsburg were held. These were held from January 31 to February 3, and were attended by 32 pastors from the Council, 18 from the General Synod, 14 from the Ohio Synod. From the ***Lutheran*** article we get the following account: 'Beginning on Monday afternoon, nine sessions were held; the six sessions during the day were especially for the pastors, and was each divided after the opening into three periods: first an hour for devotion (meditation), then a short worshipful (devotional) period, then an hour for study and exposition. The Scripture passages were chosen from Isaiah with special reference to the interpretation to be offered in the following hour. The devotions were from the 62nd and 63rd chapters of Isaiah. Chapters of Isaiah, and were especially fruitful and glorious; the Passion narrative was read in the worshipful hour, with appropriate songs preceding and following, and the expositions were based on the Epistles for Lent/ 'The evening services were arranged for such members of the congregations as wished to attend; the service period and the free devotion (**open meditation**) were omitted for want of time; the Scripture **meditation** dealt with one of the penitential psalms, and the exposition with one of the three offices of Christ, and thus the three evenings were spent in an interesting and profitable manner.' The ***Lutheran*** reports still more, especially also that at the close of the meetings one from each of the three synods represented spoke approvingly and praisingly of the meetings. Now we do not doubt that these meetings were stimulating and offered many blessings, edification, etc., but we cannot justify the participation of Ohioans in these meetings on such grounds. The very worshipful association with those with whom we do not and cannot stand in church fellowship is the opposite of edifying, because not in harmony with our confessional position. We can by all means only censure this co-operation of our brethren with such as are not in confessional union with us, so far as pulpit and altar fellowship took place in it. As well-intentioned as the matter was, it was wrong and erroneous in this respect, and the consequences cannot therefore be good in this direction. We most unwillingly censure, but our common confession on the ground of the divine word compels us to do so." What the "Church Newspaper" here rejects, it itself demanded with much impetuosity from Missourians some years ago: communal prayer services for the opening of the intersynodal conferences. And when we refused, this fact was exploited by the same "church newspaper" with fanaticism and personal agitation. Now the "church paper" laments it that Ohioans are doing in Pittsburg the very thing it so vigorously demanded of Missouri. The spirits it called forth it would now like to be rid of. It is not the Ohioans who participated in the Uniöns services in Pittsburg who are inconsistent here, but the Ohio "church newspaper." Ohio has long been Unionist in more ways than one. F. B.

**D. Delk and the General Synodist 'Zion Messenger'.** This paper writes on p. 37: 'Doctrine and Defense,' the theological monthly of the Missouri Synod, attacks the General Synod in almost every number, and always by singling out some particular cases, generalizing them, and blaming the whole Synod for them. So again in the December

of the past year. Admittedly, among the English in the General Synod there are some things going on which we do not approve. A man like D. Delk should be called to account for his fraternizing with Catholics, Jews and.Unitarians. If his district, the East Pennsylvania Synod, does not intervene, then our German Synods, with all others, should file a protest at the next General Synod meeting. In other respects, too, some of our English brethren go much too far in church fellowship with other denominations. We regret this, and hope that here again a change of conviction will take place." The "Zion Messenger" thus admits that D. Dell should be called to account. But if that should happen, it is surely also the duty of the General Synod to see that it does. In other words, it is the responsibility of the General Synod to see that the nuisance given by Delk is dismissed. So by complaining about "doctrine and woe," the "Zion's messenger" is admitting the very thing that "doctrine and woe" demands. But now it is necessary that the officials of the General Synod, or at least of the Synod to which Delk belongs, also act. If nothing is done by the General Synod to dismiss the offence, then D. Dell's sin becomes her own sin. By her silence and acquiescence she makes herself a partaker of someone else's sin. One can be guilty of a sin that one has not committed oneself. Some time ago, Father Matschoß wrote correctly in the "Theologische Zeitblatt" about the toleration of false teachers in the German national churches: "If false teachings come forth in the church, whereby God's name is profaned and the salvation of souls is endangered, then this is undoubtedly sin, but it is, for example, a sin for the church. But it is, for example, a foreign sin to the ecclesiastical superiors who have received and accepted a supervisory office, as long as they know nothing of the intrusion of false doctrine; but as soon as they have received knowledge, they must make every effort to see that the false doctrine is put away. If they act indifferently, and allow false doctrine to persist in the church, they themselves become guilty, as if they had brought up that false doctrine themselves." The fence is just no better than the stealer. This is also true in the **casus** Delk. If the officials of the General Synod remain silent about it, they themselves become guilty, as if they too had been in the Jewish temple with Delk and Rabbi Kraußkopf. And if the General Synod tolerates such officials, it too becomes implicated in the same sin. Of the inexorable severity of the moral demand that the General Synod be responsible for the public teachings and doings of its pastors and congregations, we must not relax one jot. Yes, we too would have to consider ourselves complicit, were we to silence the testimony of "doctrine and discipline" against the public vexations in doctrine and practice. What the General Synodists demand of us in this respect is basically nothing but gross indifferentism. The "Messenger of Zion" also seems to be more annoyed by the fact that "Doctrine and Discipline" from time to time puts its finger on the sore spots in the General Synod than it is eager to remedy given annoyances in doctrine and practice within its Synod.

F. B.

**The Lutheran Observer and the "Social Duties of the Church,"** D. Rauschenbusch, professor at the Baptist seminary at Rochester, has been much celebrated in ecclesiastical and secular papers as a man who has

that the main task of the church today is to solve social problems. The ***Lutheran Observer*** agrees with him, judging on p. 109 that Rauschenbusch is not only an outstanding thinker, but also has a message to the Lutheran Church of our country: "**a message to the Lutheran Church of America, urging it to concern itself with the great social problems of the day which can be solved only by the application to them of the truths and powers with which the Gospel of Jesus Christ is freighted**. Yes, p. 204, the ***Observer*** declares that in comparison with this social task of the church, its theological doctrinal disputes are secondary. Literally, "**To occupy itself with endless reiterations and discussions of its doctrinal platform, instead of bringing it to bear on the conditions of individual and social life, is as though any army equipped and commissioned to repel invasion and drive out the invaders should spend its time issuing proclamations, polishing weapons, and conducting dress parades.**" To the ***Observer, the*** struggle for pure doctrine and a sound confessional position is play-acting compared to the social duties of the church. "**There is nothing**" - says the ***Observer*** - "**that more vitally concerns the Church itself at this juncture than the way it relates itself to these social and economic problems that thrust themselves upon us with an urgency that will not be denied.**" In the ***Observer*** still lives the united and reformed spirit, which is not able to separate church and state, spiritual and secular. At the same time, with the above he clearly indicates how much he cares for the confessional statements of his Synod of 1895, 1901 and 1909.

F- B.

**The General Council and Student Volunteer Convention in Rochester. At** this convention, December 29-January 2, more than 3,000 male and female students from the United States and Canada had gathered, along with many missionaries, mission secretaries, college presidents, professors, and pastors, and again the slogan was given: "Evangelize the world in this generation!" For the mission 92 students were enlisted and $85,000 was raised. The meeting was apparently a Unionist one, and unfortunately Lutherans of the General Council participated in it. The purpose of this meeting is described by ***Lutheran*** S. 232 also: "**The purpose of the convention was to bring together representative delegates of students and professors from all important institutions of higher learning in Canada and the United States, and leaders of the missionary enterprise both at home and abroad, for helpful association and conference; to consider unitedly the leading problems of the world's evangelization; to gain inspiration and a vision of the missionary possibilities of the Church; to pray and earnestly resolve to enter with greater consecration upon the work of extending the kingdom of Christ among non-Christian nations.**" Quite unabashedly, the ***Lutheran*** adds: of the more than 3000 delegates, almost 300 were Lutherans. And with pride the "German Lutheran" of the General Council p. 33 notes: "Our Lutheran Church was also represented in this convention. . . . We may hope that the visitors to the convention, which produced such tremendous results, and our Lutheran congregations in Rochester have carried a blessing over into the new year from these memorable days." By the officers of the General Convention, then, this Unionism is approved.

F. B.

**Pius X, Fairbanks, and Roosevelt.** Towards the beginning of this year, Fairbanks, the former Vice-President of the United States, was in Rome, where he also sought an audience with the Pope. This was promised him with pleasure. But when it was announced that Fairbanks would also speak at the Methodist Church in Rome, the Pope informed him that he could only be granted an audience if he promised not to speak at the Methodist Church. But Fairbanks rejected this imposition, explaining that he had promised to speak to the Methodists and intended to keep his promise. So nothing came of the audience with the Pope, but nothing came of the Romanists' ruse to deal a blow to the Protestants in Rome and to make Fairbanks submit. The anger of the Romanists took pleasure in furious attacks in the press upon the propaganda of the Methodists in Rome. But this first humiliation was soon to be followed on its heels by a second for Pius. Already the Roman papers were exulting that Roosevelt would act differently from Fairbanks, and in any case would prefer an audience with the Pope to a visit to the Methodists. When Roosevelt therefore asked for an audience with the Pope, he was told that the Pope would receive him with pleasure if he promised not to visit and speak to the Methodists as Fairbanks had done. The Romanists thought that Roosevelt was not a Methodist, like Fairbanks, and had made no promise to the Methodists. With him, therefore, there would be no difficulty with the promise sought by the Pope, which could then be played off against Fairbanks and the Methodists and properly exploited, in Rome and in the United States. But the clever diplomats in the Vatican had miscalculated. Roosevelt promptly replied that he refused the audience because an American citizen would not allow his freedom to be restricted in the manner demanded by the Pope. Regarding Roosevelt's conduct, Fairbanks remarked: "**No American can accept audience at the Vatican upon condition that he shall not speak when, where, and to whom he likes - regardless of church or creed. It goes without saying that I fully commend Mr. Roosevelt's decision.**" It has been justly rejoiced among Protestants that the Romanists' intrigues have not succeeded in bringing Fairbanks and Roosevelt to their knees before the Pope. But does not and do not the Romanists see in the mere request for an audience an honor and recognition of the Pope and his Church? Incidentally, as regards the attacks of the Papists on the propaganda of the Methodists in Rome, Protestants point to the proselytizing of the Paulist Fathers in America, who, for instance, admit a Catholic to their meetings only if he brings a Protestant with him. - According to the latest news Roosevelt has received numerous telegrams also from American Catholics, laymen as well as priests, in which they express their joy about the independence he has preserved towards the Vatican. Among the congratulators, however, there is not a single senior cleric, not even Archbishop Jreland, who up to now has probably lied to the Americans more than anyone else about the tolerance, clemency, and broad-mindedness of the

Pope. We can add that the Pope has also suffered a defeat in Washington, for President Taft has refused to recommend to Congress the establishment of a legation to the Vatican, for which the Pope has been asking for so long. One will not be mistaken, I think, in connecting the conduct of Roosevelt and Taft also with the Lutheran protest which found so wide an echo last year. F. B.

**Cuneiform tablet on the Flood.** Among the tablets of Nippur, D. Hilprecht has found a fragment which, according to his estimate, dates from about 2100 B.C., and contains an account of the Flood which confirms the narrative of the Bible. The daily papers in Philadelphia carried the following translation of the mutilated tablet, the 14 lines of which we leave numbered (the bracketed words are Hilprecht's additions): "**1. thee 2. [the confines of heaven and earth] 1 will loosen 3. [a deluge I will make, and] it shall sweep away all men together 4. [but thou seek l]ife before the deluge cometh forth 5. [for over all living beings] as many as there are, I will bring Overthrow, destruction, annihilation 6. build a great ship and 7. total height shall be its structure 8. it shall be a house-boat carrying what has been saved of life 9. with a strong deck cover it 10. [the ship] which thou shalt make 11. [into it br]ing the beasts of the field the birds of heaven 12. [and the creeping things two of everything] instead of a number 13. and the family 14. and**." D. Hilprecht celebrated his twenty-fifth doctoral anniversary some weeks ago, on which occasion a whole number of German Assyriölogen dedicated to him a scholarly work on the finds in Babylon. D. Hilprecht is a member of a congregation of the General Council. F. B.

## II. Abroad.

**D. Theodor Kliefoth's hundredth birthday** was celebrated in Mecklenburg on January 18. Although D. Kliefoth's views of the church are wrong, for he reckoned the visibility in the confessional community to be part of the essence of the church, he nevertheless fought in his own way against the union as it rightly existed in Prussia. He rejected not only the absorptive union, which makes of Lutherans and Reformed a united **tertium quid**, but also the so-called confederative union, which seeks to unite Lutherans and Reformed at least in the common church government, and still more the German-national union, which strives for a national church, in which ultimately not the Christian faith, but the German nationality makes the member of the church. But that he was averse to the Union in any form, as has also been asserted in this country, is not correct, for with evidently false teachers within the Lutheran national churches, e. g. with Hofmann, he did not abolish church fellowship. We readily admit that he also spoke many a fine word against Hofmann, and especially against the latter's fundamental doctrine of the principle of theology. Kliefoth died in 1905.

F. B.

**Mass meetings in Berlin against Drews**. In the Monist League in Berlin, Prof. Drews gave a lecture in which he tried to prove that Jesus had never lived at all. On the other hand, two mass meetings took place on Sunday Reminiscere. The paper "Der

Montag" reports: "One meeting took place in the Busch Circus. The rush of the masses was so immense that already at 11 o'clock, one hour before the appointed beginning, the police had to close the circus. It may have been about 20,000 people who besieged the Circus Busch for hours without finding admission, until finally a crowd of about 5,000 gathered in the Lustgarten, where on the steps of the cathedral a preacher from the people addressed enthusiastic words of faith to the masses. And then something moving happened: bareheaded, the thousands sang Luther's hymn 'Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott'; then they pushed into the cathedral, which was soon filled to capacity. In the meantime, the imposing-looking gathering had begun in the Busch Circus. The general theme of the day was brief and substantial: 'JEsus lives.'" Many speeches were made, and between each speech spiritual songs were sung. The "E. L. F." rejoices over this rally, from which it emerges that Germany still harbors elements that hold fast to the faith in Christ. But it also rightly adds: "What would become of the tens of thousands who sang 'Ein' feste Burg' there, if they were to profess the Scriptural doctrines of Christ's person and work, of the Holy Scriptures as the infallible word of God, of conversion, justification and sanctification, of the means of grace, the Church, the ministry of preaching, and of the last things? Would not many take offence at this 'hard speech'? And connected with this is another question which we cannot suppress. Why did only the denial of the existence of JEsu cause such a manifestation, but not the denial of the Deity of JEsu, as it has been publicly pronounced and recorded by one Friedrich Delitzsch and P. Fischer and others? It is true that in those meetings, as far as we can see, people also confessed the deity of Christ, and in any case the majority of those present will have understood the testimony to Jesus' existence in this sense. But if, in spite of this, the open deniers of the deity of Christ remain in the office of the national church and are recognized and treated as ministers and pastors by those who have demonstrated here for JEsu's existence, then this mass demonstration loses its power considerably. For one denies, with the deed, what one professes with the mouth." - As Prof. Drews of Karlsruhe addressed the people with his dreams, and made speeches in all the larger German cities on his "Christmythe," so did Pros. Jensen of Marburg, when he was ignored by the scholars with his Gilgamesh religion, turned to the great public to find a hearing here for his folly. The liberal theologians Jülicher, v. Soden, Weinel, Thümmel, Stück and others were enough here to drive Jensen and Drews into a corner with their wild assertions. The "Christian World" throws itself into the fray and says that if the church and Christianity are really in danger, and if the struggle is for superior science, then the positives are not to be found, then it is: liberals first. What is there left in Christianity when its heart has been cut out: Christ's divinity, reconciliation, and resurrection? Then Christianity is nothing more than a drunken egg, and little is lost if the radicals then also

nor break the empty shells. If we drop the articles of Christ's deity and redemption, "it is all lost, and keeps pope and devil and all against us the victory and right." F. B.

**Religious Intolerance in Germany. The** "Christliche Welt" writes: "The preacher of the German-Catholic (free religious) congregation in Frankfurt a. M. developed a lively agitation in the surrounding area of Frankfurt. As a result, small free-religious congregations arose in Heddernheim, Oberursel, Griesheim, Höchst and other places. The parents who joined these free religious congregations sent their children to the free religious instruction held weekly by the free religious preacher in various places, and kept them from attending the denominational religious instruction in school. The result was - fines for missing school. The parents objected, and the matter came to court. In Homburg v. d. H. the accused was acquitted, in Höchst a. M. another was convicted, but on appeal was then acquitted by the Regional Court in Wiesbaden. However, the Kammergericht in Berlin, as the highest instance, overturned the Wiesbaden verdict and sentenced the parents. . . . As a result of the judgment of the Court of Appeal and the practice of the government approved by it, a very peculiar state of affairs had now been created in the administrative district of Wiesbaden. In the cities of Wiesbaden, Rüdesheim and Frankfurt a. M., the free-religious parents of children who do not attend confessional religious instruction are not punished, as it is said, in recognition of a customary right that has become historical. In these cities the free-religious congregations had existed for a long time, already since the middle of the last century. Nor are the free-religious parents, who have money and opportunity to have their children educated in the so-called 'higher' schools, punished if they keep their children away from religious instruction. In the communities near Frankfurt, Wiesbaden and Rüdesheim, however, the free-religious parents whose children attend the elementary school are forced by school penalties to have their children attend religious instruction. Only the government has generously allowed that parents who have become free-religious do not have to send their children to the classes of their former denomination. Various parents who had formerly been Catholic had in fact sent their children to Protestant religious instruction - at least because it seemed less 'bad' to them - and this had led to inquiries to the government, whereupon it was decided, as reported. " F. B.

**Unbelief in the Protestant Church at Rome.** D. Schubert, the imperial embassy preacher at the Protestant church in Rome, says in a printed sermon: The old sermon of the bodily resurrection of Christ is no longer tenable; our time demands that the emphasis be placed on the life of Jesus; the life of Jesus attracts, but the message of the bodily resurrection repels; the resurrection is no longer the basis for faith. - What a pity that in the metropolis of Antichrist the most manifest unbelief represents Protestantism! And how could a Protestant emperor let it happen that an apostle of unbelief like Schubert was made "imperial embassy preacher"? Does he not thereby give occasion to the arch-enemy of the Gospel, in

to blaspheme the gospel, so that it leads into the arms of unbelief? Last year "a visitor from Rome reported that he had heard more of the old truth in a Catholic church than in the Protestant church there. That this was no exaggeration has now been proved by the "imperial embassy preacher" himself. F. B.

**According to the Yearbook of the Anglican Church for 1909**, the number of infant baptisms was 594,931 (1200 less than the previous year), confirmands 241,249 (4000 more than the previous year), frequent communicants 2,231,753 (90,000 more than the previous year), and Sunday school students 214 million (48,000 more than the previous year). The number of church members in the 101 foreign dioceses is now 4 million. In Germany the Anglican Church maintains 25 chaplains under the Bishop of London. The report greatly laments that the number of clergy is far from meeting the most modest needs: last year again 31 fewer deacons were ordained than in the previous year (649 against 680 in 1908). The reason given is that the salaries are no longer sufficient, while the demands on the candidates are increasing. Thus it was decided last year for the diocese of Canterbury that from 1917 on only such persons may be ordained who have an academic degree (roughly corresponding to our school-leaving examination) and have attended a theological seminary for at least one year. As low as these requirements may seem, they represent a complete break with previous practice. The shortage of candidates is especially serious because the significant emigration and the growth of the colonial empire place great tasks before the Anglican Church. Emigration from England has again amounted to 300,000 in the last year, and western Canada in particular has made an unexpected upsurge in the last decade. The two Archbishops of Canterbury and York are therefore now issuing an appeal for the support of the Anglican Church in Western Canada, lest it fall behind there as it has in Eastern Canada, where in some districts only one-twelfth of the population belongs to the State Church. Fifty clergymen are therefore to be sent from the mother country to Western Canada in each of the next ten years. But whence are these auxiliaries to come, when the mother country has not even for itself sufficient candidates? Since 1885, 8121 bodies have been burned in England. The increase here is also a slow but steady one.

So Prof. Haupt, the editor of the infamous Rainbow Bible, puts it this way: "You can imagine the guests telling about it afterwards and saying, 'It was a most wonderful thing. Think of it - a feast without wine! But all soon forgot that, for there was present a most wonderful man named Jesus, who spoke so beautifully and was so gracious and good that no one minded that there was no wine. The water was poured out, and the guests drank it just as though it were wine. The personality of one man called Jesus, who was present, was so wonderful, and his influence on the others so compelling, that it made it seem as though a miracle had been performed and he had turned water into wine.... '" Prof. Haupt surpasses even the old saltless and spiritless rationalists with his miracle explanations. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56.** **May 1910.** **No. 5.**

## The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53.

(Continued.)

The third part of the Passion Sermon, Isa. 53, 7-9, reads: "He was maltreated, yet he suffered willingly, and opened not his mouth, as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that is made dumb before its shearers, and opened not its mouth. Out of tribulation and judgment he is taken away, who can fathom his life span? For he is taken away out of the land of the living; Because of the iniquity of my people the stroke fell upon him. And they assigned him his grave with the wicked, but with a rich man he was in his state of death, because he did no wrong and no deceit was in his mouth."

After describing the severe suffering of the servant, and stating the purpose and meaning of it, the prophet adds v. 7, how he suffered. It is first called XXXX XXXX XXX. In the expression XXX is summed up all that was said before of the severe suffering, the torture of the Messiah. He has been maltreated, actually aborted, rushed off like a hunted game. But now the emphasis is on the XXXX XXXX. This XXXX, separated from the first participle by XXXX, cannot be simply coordinated with the same, but is rather opposed to it. Most recent commentators therefore quite correctly take the niphal here reflexively in the sense: "he bowed down" or "he suffered willingly." Thus Delitzsch translates: "He was maltreated, while he suffered willingly and did not open his mouth." Bredenkamp: "He was maltreated while he bowed down and did not open his mouth." This statement is very appropriately followed by the comparison with the lamb that is led to the slaughter, of the sheep, the ewe, that falls silent before its shearers. This image, which then passed into the New Testament, illustrates the willing, patient suffering of the Servant of God. Already in the entrance of his sermon the prophet had remarked that the servant of the

He said that he would act wisely in obedience to the Lord, that he would carry out the Lord's counsel. And v. 4-6 he had not only said that punishment, all our sin, was laid upon him by God, but had also so expressed himself that he took sickness, pain, and thus our guilt and punishment, upon himself, appropriated them to himself. And now, v. 7, the obedience of suffering, the willingness to suffer, the patience of Christ, is expressly and emphatically brought out.

From the whole history of the Passion, this trait appears clearly before our eyes. At the time appointed by God, at the Passover of the Jews, the little lamb of God presented itself to be led to the slaughter. Before the difficult hour came, JEsus, in hot prayer, put his will entirely into God's will. He delivered Himself into the hands of the evil multitude that came upon Him. After first terrifying His enemies with His "I am," and throwing them to the ground, He Himself spoke to them, and gave them courage to seize and bind Him. He forbade his disciples to strike with the sword; he could easily, if he but willed, summon legions of angels to his aid. The pagan judge was astonished that JEsus finally did not answer him a word, that he did not open his mouth any more. It would not have taken so many more words to determine Pilate to release Him. When the actual torture began, he did not scold again, because he was scolded, and did not threaten, because he suffered. As it was prophesied in Isa 50:6, he offered his back to those who struck him, and his cheeks to those who scolded him, and did not hide his face from shame and spittle. When his distress was at its highest, he still called the god who had forsaken him his god. Dying, he put his spirit into the Father's hands. He wilfully, wilfully laid down his life, laid it down, had power to lay it down and take it up again. His death was his own act. And so the Church of Christ worships the Lamb of God, "O Lamb of God innocent, slain on the stem of the cross, ever patient, though thou wert despised." Yes, that was unique patience! Otherwise, when a transgressor receives his punishment, he at least inwardly resists it, and reluctantly submits to the inevitable. When a guilty man is tormented by his evil conscience, he tries with all his might to throw off guilt and consciousness of guilt, but in vain. The weeping and gnashing of teeth of the damned in hell is not only an expression of their unspeakable pain and anguish, but also an expression of their rage, resentment, and anger against God. Here is one who gladly and willingly takes upon himself all sin, guilt, and punishment. Otherwise, when a pious man kisses the hand of God that strikes him, blessing his cross and suffering, he does so because he recognizes in the mighty hand of God that strikes him down the Father hand of God, and sees in his cross only a wholesome chastisement, not a punishment. Here is one who

the punishment which is nothing but punishment, in which no love of God is felt, which atones for punishment in the fullest sense of the word, punishment and damnation willingly and patiently. This is patience that goes far beyond human ability, even beyond human thinking and comprehension; this is divine patience. Yes, it is the Lamb of God who suffers and dies. The patience of the Lamb of God eclipses all the reluctance, all the disobedience of the apostate sheep. The suffering Messiah is none other than the Virgin Son Immanuel, God in the flesh and blood of man. And in Christo also is incarnate the patience, the mercy, the love, the sinner-love of God. The counsel of God which He led forth was the eternal love counsel of God, concerned the salvation of lost sinners. Love for the lost drove the Son of God down from heaven to earth, and from all His doings and sufferings the sinner love of God now shone forth. St. Paul writes Rom. 5:8: "Therefore God magnify his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Human love at most brings it to the point that one dies for a righteous man, for the sake of a good cause. This is the incomparable prize and glory, the virtue and prerogative of God, that he has turned his love to sinners, to the ungodly, and that Christ, who is himself God, died for sinners, for the ungodly. That Christ allowed Himself to be martyred, scourged, crucified, spit upon, mocked, and blasphemed for us, that He willingly took God's curse upon Himself, that He took this evil part, our sin, guilt, and punishment from us and made it entirely His own, is of all the noble deeds of men, of all the great deeds and benefits of God, the greatest, most glorious deed; it is the triumph of love, of God's love for sinners. And this sinner's love of God is greater even than the sin of the whole world.

The newer ones put all their weight on the so-called ethical moment in Christ's suffering, emphasizing as strongly as possible that it is not what Christ suffered but how he suffered that matters, that Christ's suffering, this thing in itself, has no value. It is sheer folly to call and treat what Christ suffered, His torture, His bloody death, as a "thing," a "thing," a "thingly achievement." That Christ bore our pains and sickness, the whole woe of mankind, and also felt and sensed it deeply, that he suffered the punishment of our sins, according to body and soul, his soul-suffering, his soul-struggle, his conscience-struggle, that was truly no useless thing and work, those were personal and deep-intimate experiences and experiences. But of course we now add this, that Christ gladly, willingly, patiently bore and suffered all that the Father laid upon Him, that He Himself, self-willed, in obedience to God, out of love for sinners, took upon Himself our sin, guilt, punishment, and atoned for it. No forgiveness

No advocate of the **satisfactio vicaria** has ever ignored this "ethical moment. It would be unthinking to suppose that Christ, the faithful, pious servant of the Lord, the beloved Son of the Father, submitted to God's command with reluctance and was only forced to bear our burden. But it is fundamentally wrong to separate the what and how, what and how Christ suffered, the "thing," as it is called, and the person, and even to set them in opposition to each other, and to ascribe atoning power and effect only to the latter, to the willingness to suffer, and not to the suffering itself. Those theologians who wish to preserve the "morality" of redemption, and who, through the love of God, the love of Jesus, his obedience to suffering, which proved itself in suffering, and through this ethical act of God and of Christ, let the sin of the world be done away with, and thereby push the satisfaction through suffering, torture, and bleeding into the background or set it aside altogether, are thereby treading too close to the holiness and justice of the great God, and misjudge the power of sin, of evil in the world. The sin of men is truly no mere fault and defect, but indignation against God, interference with God's majesty, and therefore the ruin, the ruin, the eternal ruin of men. According to the law of eternal justice, man's sinful conduct, even his innate sinful nature, inexorably entails guilt and punishment, even infinite, immeasurable guilt and punishment, and this guilt and punishment must be borne, suffered, atoned for, if man is to be released from it, and has been borne, suffered, atoned for precisely through Christ, the eternal Son of God, our substitute. He who denies or weakens these truths offends God, the absolutely holy and good, and weakens the power and wickedness of sin, and this is not something moral, but immoral. The theologians, however, who here operate only with "ethics" and "love," are not only fighting against God's holiness and justice, but at the same time against the supreme love of God, the love of sinners, the redeeming love of God, are taking the heart out of the love of God, to speak humanly. Only he who holds fast the satisfaction of suffering, dying, bleeding, allows the willingness to suffer, the redeeming love of the Lord, to receive its due. This is the value of the willingness to suffer, that Christ was not only willing and ready to help sinful men in some way, but to save them in this way, the only possible way, by giving himself, his own life, from death and destruction. This is the redeeming love, that Christ, out of love for sinners, decided on the **satisfactio vicaria,** that he took upon himself our sin, guilt, punishment, and thus took off unZ. If the love of God is deprived of this content, all talk of love, redeeming, forgiving love, is vain wind and vapour. And by thus rightly understanding and defining Christ's willingness to suffer,

we can also speak in such a way, as for example the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, that we are sanctified by the will of Jesus, that is, redeemed, that the redeeming love, the love of Christ for sinners covers the multitude of sins. The little lamb of God, which surrenders itself to the sinner's bench, saying, I will gladly suffer it; which says to God, Yes, Father, yes, from the bottom of my heart, lay it on, I will bear it for thee; which says to the poor sinner: Forsake not thy sins; here am I, I will take thy sins upon me, I will be the sinner and the transgressor; what evil thou hast done, that will I have done, I will answer for thee; this little lamb is the delight, joy, and gladness of all saved sinners; in him the holy angels behold their delight; on this little lamb rests all the Father's good pleasure, and this good pleasure covers even the sinful men for whom God's Lamb has interceded.

As for the following sentence, v. 8, the first question is how to construct it. At the head is the statement, XXXX XXXXXX. That is, as is commonly supposed, "Out of tribulation and judgment he was taken away." This is followed by the words: XXX XXX XXXX XXX XXXX XXX XX XXXX XX XXXXXX.... Newer interpreters translate, as e.g. Delitzsch: "and his contemporaries who considered this: he was snatched away from the land of the living, in that because of the sacrilege of my people he was punished". But this is a forced structure, and the reference to the contemporaries of the Messiah, who misjudged him and respected nothing, was already dismissed in v. 3. The nearest translation of 8 b is that offered by the Septuagint: την ***γενεάν αυτόν τΐς διηγήβεται.*** "Who can think out" or "talk out" his life span? The first and next meaning of in is, after all, course of time, duration of time, age of man; from which only the other is derived: the people living in a course of time, generation. This statement very appropriately follows on from the preceding. The servant of the Lord was taken out of judgment and entered into an unlimited, imperishable life, just as it is said of him in v. 10 that he lives for a long time. We take XX v. 80 to be explicative. In that "he is taken away out of the land of the living," it is evident that it was a severe judgment from which he was taken away. The expressions "tribulation and judgment" are more fully explained. And then 8 6 is added, and repeatedly inculcated, that "because of the iniquity of my people the stroke fell upon him." The main thought in v. 8, then, is that the Messiah, delivered from anguish, distress, judgment, now lives forever. The thought connection of v. 7 and v. 8 is the same as v. 1: "my servant will act wisely . . . and so shall he arise and be exalted"; as Phil. 2:8, 9: "and he was obedient unto death. . . . Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him," etc. His obedience to suffering, his willingness to suffer, his great patience, God has given him with this

that he raptured him from suffering and transferred him to a better, heavenly, eternal life and being. Thus, in this third section of the prophetic sermon, vv. 7-9, the great change and transformation of things, the exaltation of the Messiah, is already pointed out. Indes, all that is said of the **status gloriae is** related to the preceding humiliation. The suffering and endurance of the Messiah and the **satisfactio vicaria** thereby accomplished is and remains the basic idea of the great sermon of Isaiah 53.

In the statement that the servant of the Lord is taken out of tribulation and judgment, it is **implicit** that he was first in tribulation and judgment. The suffering of Christ is here placed under this view: Judgment, XXXX. Judgment proper,
The full sense of the word is meant, the judgment that God holds over sinners, over the ungodly. Christ is torn away from the land of the living, violently torn away, swept from his place as in storm and weather. He is affected by the judgment threatened in Scripture against the ungodly, that they should be cut off from the land of the living, exterminated from the earth. After a speedy, ignominious trial, JEsus, with two other evildoers, was speedily put to death, executed; he died a violent, agonizing, cruel death. Thus God's judgment was executed upon him. Throughout the history of the godless world, whose unrighteousness and ungodliness increase from generation to generation, God's judgments run their course. The ungodly people often stir up God's vengeance and zeal with their outrages, and it follows blow after blow. And at the end of the world and world history stands the final judgment, the Last Judgment. Already the prophets of Israel emphatically pointed to the great day of the Lord, the day of judgment, when the wrath of God will burn, when the whole, full wrath of God will be poured out on all ungodly beings of men, the day of damnation of ungodly men. Now there has already been such a **dies irae in the** midst of the time of the world. On that Good Friday, God poured out the full measure of His wrath and anger on the one man, Jesus of Nazareth. The eternal Father went into judgment with His one and only beloved Son, and it was a sharp and merciless judgment. The voice of thunder that came from heaven on the eve of JEsu's passion, the great darkness that covered the whole land at the time of JEsu's death, these were signs of judgment. Yea, how, cruel God's rods, how wrathful his floods, we may see from the suffering of JEsu, from every part of his passion. But the prophet now turns out the idea of substitution in this connection also. Because of the iniquity of my people, he says, the blow, the stroke, has struck him. In Christ the sin of the world is judged. Shortly before his end the Lord spoke to his

Disciples: "Now judgment is coming on the world; now the ruler of the world will be cast out. Joh. 12, 31. The passion of Jesus is the judgment of the world. The counsel of God's love, the grace of God, has intervened in the natural course and course of sin and ungodliness, which is heading for the final judgment, has anticipated, as it were, the judgment of the world, and in Christ, the representative of the world, has judged the world. Through Christ's death the eternal destiny of mankind has already been decided. The hour of Jesus' death was the critical hour for the life of the world. The devil, the prince of the world, is now cast out, has no more right to accuse sinful men, to call down God's vengeance, wrath, curse upon them. What he demands has already been done, has already gone out to Christ. All who believe in Christ, appoint this Substitute for themselves when they are to come into judgment, they are not judged, they do not come into judgment, they are preserved from the future, eventual wrath. Only for the unbelieving, Christ-hostile world, which does not want to know anything about any substitution, any redemption, which loves darkness more than light, the Last Judgment is and remains in force, for them nothing remains but a terrible waiting of judgment and of the fiery zeal which will consume the repulsive.

But the prophet emphasizes that the servant of the Lord is taken out of tribulation and judgment, of course by the Lord Himself. This means more than when it is said of the pious that he is rescued from distress and anguish, that he is snatched out of it. It was the Lord who laid upon his servant all our iniquity and all the punishment of our sin, and that for our peace, that we might be delivered from it; and so he took him out of sin, punishment, judgment, after the purpose of his suffering was fulfilled, after he had finished all the suffering that was appointed him. The burden he bore, and that was just our burden, has been paid off, the debt has been paid, to the last farthing, dtp punishment has been atoned for, completely expiated, the wrath has been spent, the judgment exhausted. Christ, with His holiness, with His suffering obedience, has overcome, inwardly overcome, the sin that was upon Him, and that was our sin, has withstood with His eternal God-power the powers of destruction, has stood in the judgment of the ungodly, has brought out judgment to victory. He has not succumbed to the mighty blows of God's mighty hand, but has remained unscathed. He has lifted up his head again, has risen from the dead to a new incorruptible life; who will plead the length of his life? And in the exalted Christ nothing is now found or seen of sin, punishment, death, or judgment. The former things are entirely passed away. Christ died to sin, and what he now lives, he lives to God. And in and with him, our substitute, we too are caught up from sin, punishment, judgment, and into a new one,

to life everlasting. When sin, death, hell, and judgment frighten and terrify us, we take comfort in the fact that sin and punishment are on him and no longer on us. But this means that it was on him and is no longer on him, that it has been removed from him, that it has been done away with, and that it has even disappeared and come to nothing. What still oppresses and torments us is a mere phantom, an empty shadow, a nothing, **non-ens**. Admittedly, we do not yet see, feel and sense this. But in faith we are quite sure that the old has passed away, passed away forever. Only for those, and unfortunately these are most people, who despise the great prophetic and apostolic preaching of the Crucified and Risen One, and thus shred Christ's redemption for their own person, sin, guilt, punishment and judgment have again become terrible realities. The prophetic thoughts set forth here are beautifully illustrated by Luther in a sermon on Easter, St. Louis, Vol. XIII, 510 ff: "But we must, if we wish to grasp the use of the resurrection of our Lord Christ, form two different pictures before us. One is the sad, miserable, shameful, miserable, bloody picture, as we heard on Good Friday, that Christ hangs in the midst of the murderers, and dies in great pain. Such an image, as your love has heard, we are to behold with an undoubted heart, that it was all done for our sins, that he, the true and eternal priest, gave himself as a sacrifice for our sins, and paid for it with his death. For every man ought to know that his sins have wounded Christ and made him miserable, and that his sufferings are nothing else than your sins and mine. Therefore, whenever we think of or look at such a sad, bloody image, we should think of nothing else but that we see our sin there. Now if such a sorrowful image should always remain, it would be terrible. But just as in faith we hold these two articles most closely to one another: Christ was crucified, died, was buried, descended into hell, and on the third day rose again from death. For before three whole days are over, our dear Lord Christ brings with him another beautiful, wholesome, kind, joyful image, that we may assuredly learn the consolation, that not only are our sins blotted out and strangled by the death of Christ, but that by his resurrection we shall be justified and eternally saved." "Now it behooves us to take these things to heart, and firmly believe that in Christ God fought with the devil, righteousness with sin, life with death, good with evil, honour with blasphemy, and prevailed. Let us be commanded to behold this image, and let us gaze upon it often. For as we see in the first image on the silent Friday, how our sin, our curse

and death lie upon Christ, and make him a wretched and miserable man, so we see another image on Easter day, where there is no sin, no curse, no disgrace, no death, but only life, grace, blessedness, and righteousness. With such an image we are to lift up our hearts. For it is presented to us and given to us, that we should not think of ourselves otherwise than as if God himself had raised us up with Christ this day. For as little as thou sawest sin, death, and cursing in Christ, so shalt thou believe that God will see so little in thee also for Christ's sake, if thou shalt receive and be comforted by this resurrection of his. Such grace is brought to us by faith. But in that day it shall no more be believed, but it shall be seen, and it shall be grasped, and it shall be felt." "Therefore we should diligently and carefully contemplate and form in ourselves this joyful, lovely, comforting image of Easter. For in the same image there is neither sin nor death. If therefore sin should tempt thee, and conscience afflict thee, because thou hast done this or that, and art weak in the faith, hold thee here, and say, It is true, I am a sinner; I am weak in the faith, I cannot deny it: but again I take comfort in knowing that Christ JESUS hath taken my sin upon him, and bare it. But on Easter day he rose again in such a way that all sin and punishment for sin is gone."

The simplest and most natural translation of the following verse, v. 9, is this: "And they assigned him his grave with the ungodly, but with a rich man he was in his state of death (XXXXX), because he had done no wrong, and there was no deceit in his mouth." Thus, for instance, Delitzsch also translates, and remarks: "In this view prophecy and fulfilment coincide (why should we close our eyes against it?), in that the Jewish authorities gave JEsu an equally dishonest burial - see Deut. 21, 22 ff. - as to the two shepherds (κακούργοι), but the Roman authorities left the body of Joseph to the Ramathaean, a ***άν& ρωπος πλούσιος*** ." "The funeral of the deceased took a different turn from that intended for him, because there was neither wrong done nor deceit in his mouth. His actions, without exception, had pure love for their motive, his speeches shadowless veracity and truth for their content." An honorable, innocent man deserves an honorable burial. Thus, at the close of this,section, the absolute sinlessness of Christ, which was already indicated by the ^'3^ 52, 13, as the 53, 2, and was the basis of the whole execution vv. 4-6, and which belongs to the necessary conditions of the **satisfactio vicaria,** in that the righteous suffered for the unrighteous, 1 Pet. 3, 18, comes to a fully solitary expression. The burial of Christ is indeed the conclusion of the state of humiliation, and of the satisfaction made by suffering and dying. Christ is after the manner of the sinful,

He was buried in the grave of a mortal man and thus atoned for this last consequence of sin and the effect of death, lying in our place in the grave and thus freeing us from the horrors of the grave and the shame of decay, which will be revealed on that day. At the same time, however, the honor which was done to Christ in death is an allusion to the great change and transformation of things which was imminent, the resurrection to a new incorruptible life, the **status gloriosus, of** which v. 8 has already been spoken. The solemn calm and consecration spread over the tomb of JEsu was an indication that the storm had blown out, that now all the woes of men had reached their end. G. St.

(Conclusion follows.)

---

## Luther's dying.

Under the heading: "An Important Find in the Mount Airy Seminary Library" D. A. Späth made the following interesting announcement in the "Deutscher Lutheraner" of January 20, 1910:

A few months ago I succeeded in obtaining through my friend, Mr. Jakob Rommel, from the estate of his mother-in-law, Mrs. L. Bremer, a copy of Luther's Summer Postil (1543-1544), edited with considerable freedom by Cruciger, for our **Krauth. Memorial Library**. To my astonishment, upon closer examination, I found at the end of the well-preserved pigskin folio volume a handwritten entry containing an accurate account of Luther's death and, in a shorter addendum, an account of the funeral celebration at Eisleben. I was convinced that the interesting record must have come from a contemporary, indeed in all probability from an eyewitness. But who could this reporter be? As I was in no way more closely acquainted with the manuscripts of the men in question, I had a photographic facsimile of this document made and sent it to my friend, Prof. Walther in Rostock, with the request that he should examine the matter in detail and give me his judgment as to the possible author, as he is recognized as a specialist in this field. D. Walther now writes, as follows, about the significance of this find: "The award is of the highest interest. As to its contents, it certainly confirms the accounts of Luther's death hitherto known. But the form shows that this information does not rest on one of the otherwise known reports, but was created completely independently. The importance increases still by the fact that these notes were not intended according to their version for the public or also only for any outsider, but an entry into a Postille find, into a book written by Luther, printed two years ago. Also, the content shows that the thought that someone might want to spread false rumors about Luther's death did not even occur to the writer. The first award, which deals with Luther's death, will have been made on the night of his death or the following day. . . . Then, after the funeral service in Eisleben, a supplement is added about it. Since nothing is said about the transport of the body and

About the further celebrations is said, it must be assumed that the writer immediately after the service in Eisleben made the registration, also probably was not present at the famous celebration in Wittenberg, since from this also nothing is registered. That an eye-witness writes, is to be assumed from the data over the, funeral celebration, since the number of the present ones, individual personalities and the contents of the sermon of Justus Jonas in one only from the hearing (not from the pressure) of the sermon find explainable. But the writer was also present at Luther's death. . . . The handwriting is not known to me. But the style suggests that it was not a scholar but a scribe. . . . The town clerk (Hans Albrecht), in whose house Luther lived and died, is the writer of those statements. So we have a new report of an eye-witness, who, writing without any tendency, confirms what was told by the other eye-witnesses. Through him we learn some more details and a saying of Luther, which he wrote on the wall in Albrecht's house." In the hope that perhaps other Luther specialists could still recognize and fix the manuscript, D. Walther sent the facsimile photographs to Buchwald in Leipzig, and he sent them further to Kawerau in Berlin. Neither of them knew the manuscript, but Kawerau is also adamant that an eyewitness and a Mansfeld man is the author of this entry, and that this can be none other than the town clerk of Eisleben, Hans Albrecht. It is my intention to treat this interesting find in more detail in an essay for our ***Church Review***, but I thought I owed the readers of our paper this preliminary notice.

The essay promised by D. Späth will be published in the ***Lutheran Church Review in*** April. In addition to some introductory remarks about the find, it contains a facsimile of the original, the German text together with an English translation, and Walther's and other remarks. D. Buchwald wants to bring the facsimile in his next "Lutherkalender". The report, according to the exact reproduction of Späth, reads as follows:

Anno. 1. 5. 4. 6. den 17 February, Mithwochenens nach Valentini

On the evening after midnight at about 1) o'clock the Doctor Martinus Luther was weak, he lay down on his chest, but when he was admonished, he rubbed himself with warm cloths, and two spoons of white wine were given by Eynhorn, which Curdi vonn Wolfs Ramsdorff, the Doctor drank, took one spoon of white wine, and drank it. When he slept in the room, he lazed in bed for an hour and a half, when the seyger struck ten, he was brought to bed, slept for an hour and a half, and awoke his longing famulum.

Ambrofium Ruthselt, of Oelitz, that he should heat his rooms, but when they were already kept warm, he got out of bed and said to Doctor Jonah, "I am the one who is going to kill him.

1) The *Church Review* prints: "umb vly vhr" and translates: "about seven o'clock". According to the facsimile, however, it reads: "umb viii (vIII) vhr", at eight o'clock. F. B.

I am very weak, I worry I will live for two lifetimes, and went to the staircase once or twice, and then lay down on the rotting bed, and now pressed you against the breast very hard, But still his heart was still aching, so he rubbed him with cloths and kissed him, and poured water out of his mouth. He told him that he had kept him warm, but his honor had been very painful, That comforted you Michael Coelius, which beside Doctor Jonas was with him, Item Joannes Aurifober, and his famulus, But the doctor said, Jha, eß is eyn kaltter todtes schweys, Ich werde meyn geist auffgebenn, but the sickness is multiplying, so he sent for eylents, and let both of them be healed, but then we gave him **aqua vitae,** lavender water, vinegar, and other sterilizations, which water our G. Grass Albrecht and his famulus gave him. g. Grass Albrecht vnd s. g. gemahl, mit bringen, x 2) bestrichen, fieng ehr ahn so zuredende. I thank the Lord God, hymnal father, that you have revealed to me your dear son, him whom I have believed, whom I have confessed, and preached, whom I have loved, and pledged, but the godless ones to you, to you, to you, I thank you, O Lord Jesus Christ, let your soul be filled, O heavenly father, I know if I have to leave this life, that I will live forever with you. **Et dixit, Sic deus dilexit mundum, ut filium suum unigenitum daret, vt omnis qui credit in eum non pereat, sed habeat vitam aeternam, Deus qui saluos facis sperantes in te, Et reducis ex morte,** Wolan, sprach ehr ich shar dahin, vnd sprach 3mahl, **Pater in manus tuas commendo tibi spiritum meum**. Thereupon ehr stylle schweyg, vnd mahn rutteltte, vnd kultte, vnd ryff yhm, Aber ehr anthwortt nicht, Do streich mahn yhme **Aqua vitae vohr** die nase, vnd ryff lautt beyynem nahmen Doctor Jonas, And Michel, **Doctor Martine, repentant father**, you also want to die on Christ, and the teaching, "as you did to him who took it", so that you could hear the reminder clearly. Jha. So he wanted to be on the right side, and began to fall asleep, for about half an hour, hoping for improvement, but he snored, with a heavy heart, and passed away between 2 and 3 hours before noon, with great patience, may God help us all. Amen.

D. M. L.

We cannot do what an Eyderman wills. But we can do what we want.

These words have. D. Martinus Lutther, ahn die wanth geschrieben" 13 tage vohr seynem todtte.

2) There's a letter crossed out here.

On the Friday the 19 February, after 2 o'clock after noon has admonished Doctor Martinum. L. zw Eysleben zw S. Andres carried him into the church, gave him a new law, and sent for him Prince Wolf of Anhalt, Grass Heinrich von Schwartzburgk his son Sychardt, Grass Gebhardt, Albrecht, Philips, Vulradt, Jörge, Hans, and other young lords, also Grass Gebhardt's and Albrecht's wives Zymmer, and Doctor Jonas preached a beautiful sermon, which Doctor Martinus had been, And Doctor Jonas has preached a beautiful sermon, what Doctor Martinus was, what he had written, and what he had written, and how he had decided on his own end", and passed away, and interpreted the words of Paul to the end, and there have been more than 4000 people with him and his sermon, God grant us a happy end. Amen.

Walther and Kawerau judge that the author of this report about Luther's end could be none other than the town clerk Hans Albrecht, in whose house Luther lived and died and who was present at Luther's death together with Cölius, Aurifaber, Konrad von Wolfframsdorf, the two physicians and the pharmacist. However, the manuscript has not yet been verified. One believes, however, that the necessary handwritten material will still be found in the archives at Eisleben.

In the "Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung" (General Evangelical Lutheran Church Newspaper) of February 18, Walther writes with reference to the finding in Mount Airy: "But in the meantime he snored with deep fetching of breath and between two and three o'clock before noon passed away in the Lord cleanly with great patience. May God mercifully help us all! Amen." With these words concludes a recently discovered account of Luther's end, which may also claim the interest of the readers of this paper. Pros. D. Späth in America, some time ago, found a handwritten entry about Luther's death on the blank page at the end of a copy of Luther's Summer Postil of 1544. He had a photograph made of it and sent it to me with the inquiry whether I knew the manuscript and what value I attached to this information. Since I did not know this manuscript, I sent the photograph to D. Buchwald in Leipzig, asking whether he might know how to advise, and he inquired of D. Kawerau in Berlin. My opinion of the writer is in agreement with his. According to this, the record in question is of great interest.

Of course, this finding would have been even more important if it had been made twenty years ago. At that time, the former editor of the "Germania", Paul Majunke, let his book "Luther's End of Life" go out, according to which Luther was supposed to have ended up as a suicide. His source was what the great heretic enemy Sedulius had not been afraid to tell sixty years after Luther's death. Majunke declared the detailed report "Vom christlichen Abschied aus diesem tödlichen Leben des Ehrw. Herrn D. Martini Lutheri," published by the eye-witnesses Justus Jonas, Michael Cölius, and Johann Aurifaber, to be an ingenious lie, printed for the purpose of removing the news of the true facts from the world again. Now this impudent "historical lie" of Majunke's also collapsed for the Catholic judgment by the fact that the bitter opponent of Luther Joh. Cochläus, in the later editions of his work

**De actis et scriptis Lutheri** published the report of a stock Catholic eyewitness about Luther's death, and this reporter was recognized as the Eisleben apothecary who had been summoned to give the terminally ill man another enema. The information he gave proved Sedulius' bold assertions to be completely out of the blue. Thus, a researcher with a particular inclination for critical doubt could at most raise the question whether the reports that have survived from Luther's friends were not written with a certain tendency to whitewash. It is true that in addition to the official report of Luther's "farewell," as it were, we have a whole number of letters in which eyewitnesses describe in more or less detail what they saw and heard on that memorable night. But at least a Roman reader could fall to the supposition that all these statements, which were, after all, calculated for the outside world, coincided in whole or in part on the basis of agreement. This still possible doubt is now lifted by the latest find.

The writer did not intend these notes for the public, not for others, but only for himself and his own in a sermon book he used. He first reports on Luther's end, adding at the end: "**D. M. L.**. We cannot do what everybody wants, but we can do what we want. These words D. Martinus Luther wrote on the wall thirteen days before his death." Then he put such a sign, as one probably used to apply at the end of a writing. Then follows, under the heading "On Friday, February 19, after 2 o'clock noon," a brief statement of the funeral service held in St. Andrew's Church at Eisleben by Justus Jonas. This paragraph is also provided with the same closing mark. But nothing further is found. So also this entry must have been made soon after the service, since otherwise the scribe would not have disregarded the funeral sermon held the following day by Magister Cölius and the transfer of the corpse from the city. And if he were to be sought among those who escorted the corpse to Wittenberg, he would hardly have kept silent about anything else. But he must have been present at that funeral. For he names all the princely persons who took part in it, estimates the number of those present at "more than 4,000 people," and gives the content of the sermon he heard, but this in such a form that he cannot yet know the print of this sermon that was later issued, but only follows his memory: "And did Doctor Jonas a beautiful sermon, what Doctor Martinus was, how he wrote and what he wrote, also how he decided his end and fell asleep, and thirdly interpreted the words of St. Paul."

But it is further shown that the scribe was also present at Luther's death, for we also read in his report: "Meanwhile, we sprinkled him with **aqua vitae**, lavender water, rose vinegar, and other refreshments that our most gracious Count Albrecht and his gracious wife brought with them," etc. Should it not still be possible to find who is included in this "we"? The question is above all whether we may attach weight to the "our" in the words just quoted, "our most gracious Count Albrecht". Now, of course, in letters of that time, the phrase "my" or "our most gracious Count" and the like also occurs when the writer is not a subject of the lord in question (cf. e.g. the letter of Justus Jonas, "our most gracious Count"). e. g. the letter of Justus Jonas to his elector Johann Friedrich of February 18, 1546, in Kawerau, J. Jonas II, 177 ff.), but probably only in

more or less official letters, for instance addressed to princes. In a record intended only for the writer himself, one will have to take the "our Lord Count" as a proof that it is the sovereign. Then a Mansfelder has written those statements. The following Mansfelders were present at Luther's death: Magister Cölius, Joh. Aurifaber, the princely councillor Konrad von Wolfframsdors, the two physicians, the apothecary, and the town clerk Hans Albrecht. The first three do not come into consideration because their names appear in our report, the physicians because the "we" already appears in the report at the time when they were summoned but had not yet arrived. Thus we must assume the city clerk, in whose house Luther lived, as the writer. This assumption is confirmed by the handwriting. It is not that of a scholar, also not that of one of the writing less accustomed, but that of an official scribe, who does not deny also here his ability to attach pretty curlicues. Also the content of the record leads to Hans Albrecht. He namely, so we know from the other reports, has watched with the others at Luther until half past ten o'clock. Then, when Luther went to bed, he also went to sleep. But at one o'clock, when Luther's anxiety returned with great difficulty, the landlord was awakened, and he also came in at once. Our report now tells of what happened until ten o'clock, then mentions only: "Then he was put to bed and slept until one o'clock." Only then do the reports become more complete.

If we now compare these statements with those of the other eyewitnesses, nowhere does a contradiction appear, and yet they also differ from the other reports in such a way that they must have originated completely independently of one another. Two examples! When abundant sweat broke out at Luther's, then, so the official report published by Jonas, Cölius, and Aurifaber reports, "then D. Jonas and M. Cölius comforted him, saying: ... You have left a good sweat, God will grant grace that it may be better". Albrecht, however, writes: "He was comforted by Michael Cölius, who was with him along with D. Jonas, and by Johannes Aurifaber and his famulus." So he does not know exactly who addressed those words to Luther, and has not kept those words. Next, Luther's prayer, since it had become certain to him, "I will give up my spirit!" That report, which utilizes all that those three men had retained in memory, is naturally somewhat richer than that which one Hans Albrecht still remembered, and even what is common does not agree verbatim. And yet it is factually the same when Albrecht writes: "I thank thee, O HErrgod, heavenly Father, that thou hast revealed to me thy dear Son, in whom I have believed, whom I have confessed and preached, whom I have loved and vowed; but the ungodly profane and blaspheme and revile him. I beseech thee, O Lord JESUS CHRIST, let my soul be committed unto thee. O heavenly Father, I know if I must already leave this body, that I may live with thee for ever." - Thus we have in these notes of the Eisleben town clerk a new proof that the writers of that official report told the truth, when at its close they testify before God and on their own last journey and conscience that they "tell it no other way than as it has happened and happened everywhere." Above all, however, it is again confirmed in what our Reformer placed his confidence at the gate of eternity, solely in the fact that God had revealed to him his dear Son, and that he had in truth believed in Him, from which it follows that he will live eternally with God. This is the

Legacy of the great man of God to all who seek to honor him and yet are in danger of preaching a different gospel than the one he preached.

This authentic report, written immediately after Luther's death, will cause no small headache to the Romanists who periodically, also in the United States, rehash their shameless lies about Luther's "end with terror" and serve them up to their believers. The nature of these lies can be seen in Walther's book "Für Luther wider Rom" (p. 191 ff.):

This trust (in his Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, that he would stand firm in his faith) did not deceive Luther, not even in death. Of course, the Romans must not admit this. He who, according to their drawing, never got out of remorse during his life, they must also let him die in despair. Only one thing can still be doubtful, in what figure they shall draw this shattering despair of the great apostate. Therefore, some prefer to describe only in general terms that he was taken by the devil, while others more boldly state the manner of death. The fact that they are then of quite different kinds of death does not add to the success, because they all prove the one thing from which alone it depends, namely, that he died a miserable death. A more cautious way was followed by a writing printed in Italy, which unfortunately appeared already a year before Luther's death. It was sent from Augsburg to Philip of Hesse. The latter had the Italian writing translated into German and sent both to the Elector of Saxony with the request that it be forwarded to Luther. And the latter had it printed, expressing in a short epilogue his joy that "the devil and his scales, pope and papists, are so cordial to him". Naturally this writing is very disagreeable to the Romans. They therefore declare that the Catholic origin of this piece of work is not proved; perhaps Philip of Hesse had it made in order to bring Luther still more into armour against the Papists. As if Luther had ever been too mild-mannered against the papists, and now even in those days when he had printed his very sharpest writing, "Of the Papacy at Rome, Founded by the Devil," of which Philip of Hesse already knew! If, however, that "French liar's writing," which Luther thus exposed to the scorn of the whole world, had really not been genuine, the Catholics of that time would not, of course, have let this appalling insult stand, but would have proved the writing to be a forgery, which was easy to do at that time, when it was supposed to have just appeared. Since they preferred to keep silent about it, the Catholic origin is proven. According to this writing, Luther, before his death, demanded the exhibition of his body from an altar and divine worship of it, and died and was buried after receiving the Lord's Supper. But in his grave a terrible noise was heard, and the host which he had partaken of was raised into the air. When the tomb was opened, the body was gone, but a hellish stench came forth. Other Catholics said that Luther had been taken alive by the devil, that is, that his corpse was not there at all; still others said that the devil had strangled him in bed; it was also thought that the bloody marks were still visible on the neck of the corpse. Some also claimed that on this occasion the devil had clearly shown himself "in a frightening and cruel form", e.g. as "a large shepherd dog". Others

were content with the story that Luther, without having confessed and received the last rites, died a sudden death, that is, he was found dead in bed in the morning. It is also emphasized that he slept together "with his nun" Katharina von Bora, or it is further reported that he was strangled by her. We are also told of great crowds of ravens that accompanied the funeral procession; these ravens were said to be the devils who, for the time of the funeral of their prophet Luther, had to leave the possessed in which they had taken up their abode, "lest it should appear that one of them was missing at such a solemnity," etc. When 43 years had elapsed since Luther's death, the Italian Oratorian Thomas Bozius ventured to print that he "had heard that it had recently been learned, through the testimony of a witness who had then been his servant and had later come over to us, that Luther had prepared for himself a miserable death by hanging." Fifteen years later the Franciscan Sedulius gained the courage to have the alleged statement of Luther's supposed servant printed according to its alleged wording: The servant had put his totally drunken master to bed that evening and found him hanging from the bedpost the next morning! Sedulius claims to have received this statement from an unknown "credible man," which the unknown servant is supposed to have given to an unknown "pious man. Thus the same Sedulius who also tells us of the "innumerable multitude of those dreadful cawing ravens," which in reality were devils drawn out of possessed persons for the purpose of attending Luther's funeral for some time. "For it was fitting that he who had seduced so immense a number to hell should also be solemnly led to hell by immense numbers." The Jesuit Gottlieb wrote in 1883: "I possess an account of Luther's passing, for the credibility of which I have a guarantee, which is at least more valid to me than the 'eye-witnesses' Jonas and Cölius." But he did not yet dare to claim that this "tale" was reliable. He therefore wrote: "As far as I am concerned, I attach no weight to this narrative." But the former editor of the "Germania," Father Majunke, declared in 1890, by the statements of the scribes mentioned, that it was proved that Luther had ended by suicide.

These and other clumsy lies and vituperations burst like soap bubbles on the simple report of Hans Albrecht. Admittedly, the Römlings will not be helped by this latest document, for they want the lie; but their mouths can be shut with this and other documents still available. After all, according to D. Walther, at least five letters have been preserved in which eyewitnesses of Luther's death report on the shocking event that very night! In addition, there is the already mentioned report of Landau, the Catholic pharmacist in Eisleben, which was first communicated by Cochlaeus, an enemy of Luther; furthermore, there is the funeral oration of Cölius and the official "Report of Luther's Death" by Jonas, Cölius and Aurifaber, from which the main section may follow here:

But on the 17th of February the Lord and Count V. G. H. himself asked, and all told me, that he (Luther) did not want to go into the big rooms to the trade before noon, but to rest; then he said in his

He lay on a small leather bed in the parlour, walked and prayed in the parlour, but in the evening and in the morning he sat on his chair at the table in the large parlour. And that same supper before (when he passed away blessedly in God shortly before three o'clock in the morning) he spoke many important words and discourses about death and future eternal life. . . Not long after these words he arose, and went into his parlour, and his two little sons, Martinus, Paul, iM. Cölius soon followed him, he lay down in his parlour in the window to pray, M. Cölius went down again. Cölius went down again, and Johannes Aurifaber **Vinariensis** came out, and the doctor said, "But I am sore and afraid, as before about the breast;" and Johannes said, "I have seen, when I was preceptor to the young gentlemen, when they were ill about the breast, or otherwise, that the countess had given them a unicorn; if you want it, I will fetch it," and the doctor said yes. Then John, before he went to the countess, ran down in haste, and called D. Jonas and M. Cölio, who had not been out for more than two fathers, and ran up quickly.

When we came up, however, he complained hard about his chest, because we rubbed him well with warm cloths from hour one (according to his usage, as he used to do at home), so that he felt and spoke: He would be better, Count Albrecht himself came running with M. Johann, brought the unicorn, and said to the grass: How is it, O dear doctor? And the doctor said, "There is no need, my lord, it is beginning to get better. Then Count Albrecht himself harmed him with the unicorn, and after the doctor felt better, he left him again, and his advisors, one Conrad von Wolfframsdorf, besides us D. Jona, M. Cölio, Johann Ambrosio, were left with him, and at the doctor's request the scraped unicorn was given to him in a spoonful of wine, since Conrad von Wolfframsdorf had previously taken a spoonful himself (so that the doctor would have all the less pain).

Then he lay down safely at nine o'clock on the little resting bed, and said, If I could sleep half an hour, I hope all will be better; so he slept gently and naturally for an hour and a half until ten o'clock, when we Doctor Jonas and 24th Michael Cölius, together with his servant Ambrosio and his two little sons, Martino and Paulo, remained with him. But when he awoke presently at the point of ten o'clock, he said, Behold, sit ye still, may ye not go to bed; answered we: No, doctor, now shall we watch and wait upon you. With this he desired to rise, and also arose from his bed of rest, and went into the chamber that is near the parlour, which is shut up with windows for all the air; and though he complained nothing there, yet when he was passed over the threshold of the chamber, he said, Walts God, I go to bed. **In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum, redemisti me Domine Deus veritatis**.

Now when he went to bed, which was well prepared with warm boards and pillows, he lay down, and shook hands with us all, and said good night. Jonah, and Mr. Celi, and the rest of you, pray for our Lord God and his gospel, that it may go well with him; for the Council of Trent and the wicked pope are angry with him. Jonas, his two sons, Martinus, Paul, his servant Ambrose, and other servants stayed with him in the chamber during the night. These twenty-one days they kept the light in the chamber every night, but the same night they also kept the room warm, so he slept well with natural snorting, and until the clock struck one he woke up,

and called his servant Ambrofium to heat the rooms for him. But when the same had been kept warm all night, and Ambrosius the servant returned, Doctor Jonas asked him whether he felt weakness again, and he said, Oh, dear God, how I am in such pain, oh, dear Father Jonas, I think I will stay here at Eisleben (where I was born and baptized); to which Father Jonas and Ambrosius the servant answered, Oh, Reverend Father, God our heavenly Father will help through Christ. Jonas and Ambrosius the servant answered: Ah, **Reverend Father**, God our heavenly Father will help through Christ, whom you have preached. Then, without help or guidance, he went through the chamber into the parlour, and, as he went to bed, he spoke these words: **In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum, redemisti me Domine Deus veritatis**. Once or twice he went back and forth in the parlour, then he lay down on the little bed and complained that it pressed him very hard around the chest, but it still spared his heart. Then they rubbed him with warm cloths, as he desired, and as was the custom in Wittenberg, and warmed him with pot and paw, for he said it helped him well that they kept him warm.

Before all this, and now that the doctor was lying down on his bed, M. Cölius came running out of his chamber close to ours, and soon after him Johannes Aurifaber, then the innkeeper, Johann Albrecht, the town clerk, and his wife were awakened in a hurry, as were the two physicians in the town, all of whom (since they lived close by) came running in a quarter of an hour. First of all the landlord with his wife, then Simon Wild, a physician, and Doct. Ludwig, a physician, soon after Gras Albrecht with his wife, which countess brought all kinds of spices and refreshments with her, and did not cease to refresh him with all kinds of strength; but in all this the doctor says: Dear God, I am very sore and afraid, I am going there, I will now stay well in Eisleben. Then D. Jonas and M. Cölius comforted him and said: **Reverend Father**, call upon your dear Lord Jesus Christ, our high priest, the one mediator, you have left a great good sweat, God will grant grace that it will be better. Then he answered and said, Yea, it is a cold dead sweat, I will give up my spirit, for the sickness increaseth: whereupon he began and said:

O my heavenly Father, one God and Father of our Lord JEsu Christ, thou God of all comfort, I thank thee that thou hast revealed unto me thy dear Son JEsum Christum, in whom I believe, whom I have preached and confessed, whom I have loved and vowed, Whom the wretched pope and all the ungodly profane, persecute, and blaspheme, I beseech thee, my Lord JEsu Christe, let my sea-likeness [(sea-likeness he actually spoke) without doubt, humble himself for God, as if he should say: As a poor creature am I against thee, thou great, infinite, eternal Majesty. Joh. 3, 18. Ps. 68, 211 be commanded. O heavenly Father, though I must leave this body and be torn from this life, yet I know assuredly that I shall abide with thee for ever, and that no man shall be able to pluck me out of thy hands. - Further also he said, **Sic Deus dilexit mundum, ut unigenitum filium suum daret, ut omnis, qui credit in eum non pereat, sed habeat vitam aeternam**. And the words from the 68th Psalm: **Deus noster, Deus salvos faciendi, et Dominus est Dominus educendi ex morte**. That is German: We have a God of salvation, and a Lord, the Lord, who leadeth us out of the midst of death.

In this the magister tried a very delicious medicine, which he always had in his pocket for need, of which the doctor took a spoonful; but he said again, "I am going away, I will give up my spirit," and so he said.

three times very hurriedly to each other: **Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum, redemisti me Deus veritatis**. Now when he had commanded his spirit into the hands of God the heavenly Father, he began to be still: but one shook, rubbed, cooed, and called to him; but he closed his eyes, answered not. Then Count Albrecht's husband and the physicians stroked his pulse with all kinds of tonics which the doctor had sent him and which he himself was accustomed to use. But while he was so quiet, D. Jonas and 24th Cölius called to him: "**Reverend Father**, do you want to die from Christ and the doctrine, as you preach it, all the time," he said, so that one could hear it clearly: Yes. With this he turned on his right side and began to sleep, almost a quarter of an hour, that one also hoped for recovery; but the physicians, and we all said that sleep was not to be trusted, shone lights diligently under his face. In that hour, Count Hans Heinrich von Schwarzenburg, together with his husband, also came, after which the doctor soon turned very pale under his face, his feet and nose became cold, and he took a deep but gentle breath, with which he spent his spirit with silence and great patience, so that he no longer had a finger or a leg, that he no more moved a finger nor a leg, and could never perceive (this we bear witness to God on our conscience) any uneasiness, torment of body, or pain of death, but passed peacefully and gently in the Lord, as Simeon sings. . ..

May the eternal heavenly Father, who called the aforementioned D. Martinum to the great work, and our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he faithfully preached and confessed, and the Holy Spirit, who gave him such special joy, great courage and heart through his divine power in many high battles, help us all to such a Christian departure from this miserable life and to the same eternal blessedness. - We D. Justus Jonas and M. Michael Cölius and Johannes Aurifaber **Vinariensis**, above named, as we have been at the blessed father's end from the beginning to his last breath, testify this for God and from our own last journey and conscience, that we have not heard or seen this otherwise, together with the princes, counts, lords and all who come to it, and that we have not told it otherwise than as it has happened and is happening everywhere. May God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ grant us all his grace, amen. (Luther's Works, Leipzig 1731, Vol. 21, p. 693 ff.)

How true, faithful, and without all falseness Luther's end is described, especially in this official report of Jonas, Cölius, and Aurifaber, is shown by Walther in his writing "Zur Wertung der deutschen Reformation" in an essay on "Luther's End," which we also let follow here for the sake of completeness:

When Döllinger in 1850 wrote his little book "Luther. Eine Skizze", he preferred not to report more about the end of the Reformer than: "In such a mood death overtook him on February 22, 1546 in Eisleben", with this false statement of the day of death documenting his insufficient acquaintance with the subject treated. Janssen, too, only liked to hint faintly at how he thought of Luther's end by writing, "The following night his soul came before the eternal judge." Majunke has filled this unwanted gap in the Roman Luther legend by having the Reformer end up as a suicide, since 60 years after his death the Minorite Sedulius claims to have received a confession from a (not further specified) man, which a "certain valet de chambre" of Luther (whose name no one has

The world wants to be deceived!") to another (likewise unnamed) man at an unknown time about the true cause of Luther's death. One could pass over such audacity with the sigh: "The world wants to be deceived!" to the order of the day. But whoever has had the experience that every accusation brought against Luther, when thoroughly considered, only serves to make his greatness appear in all the brighter light, will also feel moved by this achievement of Roman historiography to study again carefully the records concerning the Reformer's end. Streams of living water flow from him, even from the dying man.

In addition to the reports of his death in the many letters of those who were present, we have a detailed account of his end. By order of the Elector of Saxony, "Justus Jonas, Michael Cölius, and others who were present" compiled and published an "account" of "the Christian farewell from this life of the Honorable D. Martin Luther. Over this the Roman polemicists generally hasten with the very convenient assertion that the same is, of course, a mere fiction to conceal the true facts. But we examine it without prejudice, whether there are to be discovered in it sure marks of credibility, or else traces of deliberate falsification of the facts. To the admirers of Jesuit morality we will not, of course, be allowed to refer to the fact that the reporters most solemnly affirm the truth of their statements before God and on their conscience: "We, D. Justus Jonas and M. Michael Cölius and Johannes Aurifaber, as we have been at the blessed Father's end from the beginning to his last breath, bear witness to this before God and to our own last journey and conscience, that we have not heard or seen this otherwise, and that we do not tell it otherwise than as it has gone and happened everywhere." But we maintain that this report, on closer objective examination, proves in the clearest manner not to have been fabricated, but to have corresponded to the facts with scrupulous conscientiousness.

A fictitious account to glorify the Reformer would at first have turned out considerably shorter, for instance in the manner of that small writing printed in Italian in Rome a year before Luther's death, which knows only to speak of the last moments of the "damned in soul and body" and of the miraculous signs that were supposed to prove that he had been taken by the devil. If our "Report" is not to be a historical memorial, but a mendacious glorification of Luther's end, how does it come to begin not only with the sudden illness of February 17, but also to give all that Luther had experienced since his departure from Wittenberg on January 23? Why is it not concluded with his "peaceful and gentle passing away", why is it also widely reported what was done with the body, by which way and under whose escort it was brought to Wittenberg, and how it was buried? All this did not at all serve the glorification of Luther, which was supposedly the only intention. And what then is the purpose of this annal-like account, which is kept in the manner of a protocol, since the date and, for the more important days, also the hour are given for everything that is narrated, sometimes quite definite, as when it says: "But when he awoke immediately at 10 o'clock," or: "Until the Seiger struck one," and sometimes so indefinite, as when we read: "Then he lay down safely at 9 o'clock on the little resting bed"? How do the reporters come to the many

They give detailed information that has absolutely nothing to do with their supposed tendency, such as that at this moment the one had come and the other had gone; what conversations they had about the medicine; that "Konrad von Wolfframsdorf had previously taken a spoonful of unicorn mixed in wine, so that the doctor would have all the less hesitation" to take it; how it was with the heating and lighting in the rooms; how long Luther slept between the attacks of pain, etc.? Or why do they put words into Luther's mouth which they themselves find very striking? Thus they say that he prayed, "My Lord Jesus Christ, let my soul be besought." The word "sea-likeness" was so strange to them, that they expected the readers also would not be able to find their way into it, that they therefore added the remark, "Sea-likeness he actually spoke, without doubt humbling himself before God, as if he should say, How a' poor creature am I against thee, thou great, infinite, eternal Majesty!" Why this prolixity, if they meant to feign anything? Why did they not choose another word, if anything but the desire to give an absolutely accurate account guided them?

The Romans, of course, who regard this whole account as a lie, will not spare even the consequence of passing off all these apparently unnecessary particulars for mere ingredients for the purpose of concealing the real tendency. But what a refinement of falsehood is thus attributed to Jonas and Cölius! When else would these two men ever have shown even a similar acumen, an even approximately equal gift of poetry! But whoever wants to credit them with such "art" will at least have to admit that they did not show the slightest trace of it in other respects when they wrote their report. If they wanted to glorify Luther by inventing a beautiful ending, they would have painted quite a different picture. In the "Lives of the Saints," which have been distributed in great numbers, they had the best models, if they wanted to impute to the Reformer the death of a saint, as the world thought of him. Why, then, do they tell nothing of miraculous signs which accompanied his end, nothing, for instance, of a heavenly voice which promised him the crown of life, as happened to St. Columbina; nothing of a star with a lovely glow which they saw rising to heaven at the moment of his passing, as was the case with the death of St. Thomas Aquinas? Why do they not let the corpse of Luther "look so lovely under the eyes, quite as if it were still alive," and let "an altogether lovely smell go out from it for four days," as was to be read of St. Elizabeth? In such tracks, but admittedly in the opposite direction, moves that already mentioned "Welsh liar's writing of Luther's death", in that it reports of "frightening rumor and tumult" in the coffin, of a host floating in the air, of a sulfurous stench, which one had encountered in the grave instead of the corpse taken by the devil. The later Roman legends about Luther's death work in the same manner, according to which a large number of hideous devils danced on the edge of the fountain in front of the death house in Eisleben shortly before Luther's death, according to which an innumerable number of horrible cawing ravens escorted the funeral procession to Wittenberg, "no doubt demons gathered for Martin Luther's funeral. But our "Report" knows nothing of such stories. Why not? Did the reporters think that the invisible world could not enter the visible world? Did they not believe

in apparitions of devils or angels? Is that why they did not invent a miracle to glorify their Master's death? No, that is why they do not tell such things, because they do not write poetry, but report it.

It may not be incorrect to assume that friends of Luther have already felt a little disappointed when reading this report. Especially those who have not formed an idea of the death of the believer according to reality, but according to "Christian stories", will be tempted to believe that Luther, the great hero of faith, had a somewhat different farewell than the one actually described to us. Who so often in life preached so grandly of the victory of faith over death, and praised the hour of death as the hour of most blessed salvation, should he not have looked the approaching death in the same way as we read of many a Catholic saint who "welcomed death with joy and laughter"? But how clearly one perceives in Luther the natural horror of death! When Justus Jonas asks him how he is, he answers: "Oh, dear God, how I am so sorry! Alas, dear D. Jonas, I respect, I will remain here at Eisleben, where I was born and baptized!" Then, as one seeks to combat the attack of weakness and pain by the most diverse means, "the doctor says in all this: Dear God, I am very sore and afraid! I am going there; I will now probably stay at Eisleben." When they then, "to comfort him," refer to the promising sweat that has broken out, he answers: "Yes, it is a cold death-sweat; I will give up my spirit, for the disease multiplies." Thus no friend of Luther's poetizes his mood of death.

And should not the man who had so often edified his friends with his godly conversations, of whom she has just reported that in the last three weeks before his end she "heard a great deal of fine comforting talk from him," that he "also laid out many important comforting sayings of Scripture over the table," that on the evening of February 17 he had still "spoken many important words and talk of death and future eternal life," should he not also have edified those standing at his bedside with unctuous conversations as death approached? After all, according to their report, he kept his senses and speech until the end; he spoke many a word that was, so to speak, meaningless, such as: "If I could slumber for half an hour, everything would be better," or: "Are you still sitting up? Wouldn't you like to go to bed?" How much more edifying his end would have been for some if the reporters had let even the two talks of death and eternal life, which they report as having been heard from him on the evening of February 17, be talked about a few hours later, if they had not put such things into the mouth of the healthy, but of the dying man! Surely art did not belong to such poetry. To be sure, they tell of the dying man's ever-repeated prayers. But even in these prayers he is, as it were, occupied with himself alone, as if he had enough to do with overcoming death, and therefore could not think much of others. And what does he pray? Apart from a short free prayer, there are only Bible verses, and by no means those in which death is welcomed or seen as overcome, so that it could have served to edify others and to glorify himself. It is the simple word: "Thus God loved the world," then that passage Ps. 68, 21, which hopes for salvation from the misery of death, and finally "three times with great haste: **Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum. Redemisti me, Deus veritatis**".

Thus no one poetizes the end of him whom he considers the most spiritually anointed servant of God.

Finally, how often in life had Luther pronounced the proud certainty that his doctrine was the only truth, that he would live and die by his doctrine! Was it possible that such a testimony should be missing from a fictitious report of his end? What a strengthening impression it must have made on all his followers, what a weight it must have carried even with his enemies, if, in the face of death, he had once more testified triumphantly that his doctrine was the true one, and that it would make him appear joyfully before his judge! But nothing of the kind do they tell us. Should they not have thought of it, should they not have noticed what a necessary trait they had let slip from their poetry? On the contrary! They missed this trait in the actual dying of Luther, missed it so much that Jonas and Cölius, when "he became so quiet" and they perceived that he would of his own free will speak no more, could not refrain from disturbing his rest and "strongly interjecting to him: **Reverend Father**, do you want to die constantly from Christ and the doctrine which you preach?" He gave them the answer they longed for. But in what way? How would they have written if they had been able to depart even a little from the truth? Surely they would have ascribed to him a confident voice, as it were vigorously rallying the last strength, and a full-sounding, victorious testimony. But they report as their answer only the one word, "Yes," and say no more than "that it could be clearly heard."

If the sublimity of the account of JEsu compels the confession: **Gela ne s'invente pas**, every prudent reader must judge the same of the account of Luther's death for the opposite reason, because the whole is kept too simple and puts the dying man in too unbrilliant a light. But how are we to think about this end of Luther, if it was like this and not otherwise? Was not v. Hofmann right when he once cried out to Döllinger: "Ask, reverend sir, ask God for JEsu Christ's sake, that he let you die the death of this just man; for no pope nor saint, as many as they are, has died a better one"? Well, Luther's end is that of a truly righteous man. The characteristic of this death is the same inner truthfulness which one must always admire in the Reformer during his life, since he never pretended to be other than he really was, since he could never assume a halo, since he did not even have to force himself to be truthful, but rather could not unconsciously be other than true. From whom, then, do the Romans know, without exception, all the evil things which, with a semblance of right, they accuse him of? From whom have they learned that he "felt his flesh well," that at first he was afraid of the death of a heretic, that at first "his heart often faltered," that all his life long he had to go through temptations? By no one but himself. What impression such "self-confessions" would make on others he did not even ask. He could not help but give himself as he was. And so he died. Even in death he was not ashamed of himself. He did not even think about what kind of death his friends might expect of him. The temptation to affect anything did not come to him. When he felt his end approaching, he felt wholly and freely, like St. Paul 2 Cor. 4:5, the natural horror of that which is most unnatural, of "being broken." And because he felt this, it did not occur to him to try to convince others by holy talk, or by an imposing confession of

but his soul withdrew, as it were, to itself, just as the individual warrior surrounded by enemies in battle no longer thinks of his comrades-in-arms because he has enough to do with the enemies charging against him personally.

But it is precisely in this context that the glory of his death is all the more impressive. Just as his joyful willingness to go to Worms was all the more admirable because he thought he saw the funeral pyre before him and was terrified of it; just as his certainty of faith shines all the brighter because he did not hide the difficulties of faith from himself, but tasted them deeply in the temptations: so it is with his death. He who conceals the power of death or suppresses the horror of it that stirs in his heart with pious phrases does not truly triumph over death, even if he seems to die with godliness. Luther, however, felt what it meant to die with all the strength of his deep soul, and yet there is not the slightest trace in him of a rebellion against death. He does not accept the comfort offered by his friends' wish that the sweat he has broken out promises recovery. He does not need it. He has a strength that makes him face reality firmly: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; thou hast redeemed me, O Lord, thou faithful God!" The questions as to where he would "go," what was waiting for him there, whether he was preaching the right doctrine, do not come to him at all. There is no answering confession before men, for the very reason that the certainty in him is far too strong and clear to need reflection and discussion. For that it lives in such a way in his inner being is shown by the prayer with which he lays himself down in the boat of death: 'O my heavenly Father, one God and Father of our Lord JEsu Christ, thou God of all comfort: I thank thee that thou hast revealed unto me thy dear Son, JEsum Christ, in whom I believe, whom I have preached and confessed, whom I have loved and vowed, whom the wretched Pope and all the ungodly profane, persecute, and blaspheme.' I beseech thee, my Lord JEsu Christe, let my soul's realm be commanded unto thee. O heavenly Father, though I must leave this body and be torn from this life, yet I know assuredly that I abide with thee forever, and that no one can snatch me out of thy hands." - As true love is more inconspicuous, but incomparably more beautiful than the love invented in novels, so the dying of a Luther, a true Christian, is more pompous, but still much more magnificent than the dying described in Catholic legends and Pietist stories, either faked by the narrator or by the dying person himself.

From the funeral sermon, which Cölius preached to Luther on February 20th in Eisleben, we let follow here only the words, with which he introduces and concludes the report about Luther's departure, which agrees with the above official and more detailed "Historia":

Secondly, we also want to say and hear how he (Luther) died. For he has not yet been buried, nor has he been dead more than a day, and, as it seems to me, people are ready to say, driven by the evil spirit, that he was found dead in bed. Now I have no doubt, he that is a liar from the beginning shall devise many more and swifter lies. For he now no longer cares for Doctor Luther, whom God hath plucked from his teeth.

But now he is concerned about the doctrine, which he would like to harm and destroy. But that we may meet him, and keep the faithful for lies, I, as one that was with him three weeks day and night at his last departure, will shew the truth of his departure here in God's stead, and for God. - I have told this at length, first of all, so that the devil and his followers may be stopped in their lying maw, and since it will be said otherwise than as now heard, it will not be believed. For I and others who have been beside it want to be living witnesses, whoever wants to give us faith, good; whoever does not want to, let him go, lie and lie on his own tax, he will finally find his judge well, I know God's praise that I have given testimony to the truth in this. 3) Secondly, I have also wanted to tell this story, so that we may also learn to prepare ourselves for this last hour and make ourselves skilful, as this our faithful shepherd and teacher has prepared himself, etc. (l. c., 702 f.).

Christ is the King of truth; for this purpose he came into the world, that he might bear witness to the truth, and he who is of the truth hears his voice. His kingdom is the kingdom of truth. Now it corresponds to this that the kingdom of the Roman Antichrist κατ' ***ἐξοχήν is*** the kingdom of lies. It rests on vain lies, and only through lies does it build and maintain itself. Therefore, as soon as Luther began to testify to the Christian truth, "**omnia Diaboli ora**" also began to spew their venom about Luther and his Gospel, and to this day these lies have not ceased. As early as 1538, Luther wrote in the preface to the Schmalkaldic Articles, "How can I alone shut all the devil's mouths?" "What will become more and more after my death?" At the same time, however, it was certain to him that the Papists, by their lies, were at bottom only harming themselves. "But," says he, "what they gain by it is seen in the day. For since they have lied so shamefully against us, and have sought to keep the people with lies, God has ever continued his work, and made their multitude smaller and ours larger, and let them be put to shame with their lies, and still continue." There will be few papists even today who would not be inwardly convinced that the invectives with which their priests heap upon Luther are lies. And where the "mouths of the devil" still succeed here on earth, their disgrace will be the greater before the judgment seat of Christ. Therefore Luther continues: "I must tell a history. Here in Wittenberg a doctor was sent from France who publicly said on our behalf that his king was certain and certain that there was no church, no authority, no marital status among us, but that everything was going among itself like cattle and that everyone was doing everything in his power.

3) These and other similar affirmations find their sufficient explanatory ground in the fact that the papists had already spread invective about Luther's death before his death, and that Cölius, as he mentions in his sermon, knew of lies about Luther's end as early as February 20.

F. B.

Man what he will. Now consider, how will they look upon us in that day for the judgment of Christ, who by their writing have imagined such gross lies to be true to the king and to other countries? Christ, the Lord and Judge of us all, knows that they have lied and lied, and that they shall hear the judgment again; this I know for certain. Let God convert to repentance them that are to be converted; and to the rest it shall be said, Woe and alas for ever!"

Yes, "nu rat," how and with what eyes Janssen, Majunke, Denifle, and all who believe and spread their lies, will look upon Luther at the Judgment Seat of Christ on the Last Day! F. B.

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1st Synodical Report of the Central Illinois District, with instructive proceedings on the subject: "The First Article of the Augsburg Confession." (12 Cts.) 2nd Synodical Report of the Kansas District, with a thorough paper on the doctrine of good works. (18 Cts.) 3. "**Auxiliarium**." Draft Sermons from the Fifty Years' Ministry of Blessed Father C. Gross ssn. Third booklet. (45 Cts.) To be obtained from Father E. M. Gross, **Box 225, Pleasant Plains, Ill.** and in Canada from C. Gross, **Sebringville,** Ont. 4. "In Memory of Your Baptism." (25 Cts.) 5. "**Memento and Certificate of Baptism**." (25 Cts.) These last two 'booklets, 12 pages in duotone lithograph, also serve as baptismal certificates. The cover and the actual certificate are in color lithographic printing. One page is intended for a photograph of the person to be baptized. The remaining pages contain Bible verses and hymns in decorative script. F. B.

**Anthology of characteristic preludes** to the most common Chorales of the Lutheran Church. Issues 1-4. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo.

This work, magnificent in its kind, will be published in three issues: "Issue H. 13 Heste of about 48 pages each. Every month about two issues or a double issue sent postage free. Price: $10.00. issue 0. 13 issues, as in issue H, but in two **Flexible Pebble Cloth covers**, delivered by August 1, 1910. Price: $12.00 postage paid. Issue 8. Same as Issue 0, but in the best **Seal Grain leather binding**. Price: $13.50 postage paid." Published so far are four Heste with 200 prelims. **Concordia Publishing House** says of this anthology, "This collection of preludes will comprise about 624 pages of neat lithography, each plate about 10½X7½ inches of music engraving on a sheet area of about 14X11 inches, the size of American '**sheet music,**' only in landscape instead of portrait. There are nearly 700 preludes, some easy, others less so, and only a few difficult to perform for organists of average talent and skill, but there are always several preludes to the most frequently used chorales. All the pieces have a churchly character, indeed they bear a distinctly Lutheran stamp, without exposing themselves to the accusation of pedantry. Most of them are short, that is, short enough not to lose the essential quality of a prelude, but a few festive preludes are long enough to deserve the name Festvorspiel. Most are taken from the works of tried masters of church organ music, but pleasing samples of recent American Lutheran composers may confidently be included; for we need not be at all ashamed of the achievements of our more distinguished composers." - Every congregation should purchase this noble and rich work for its organist. F. B.

Ev.-Luth. Dogmatik von **Dr. theol.** Adolf Hönecke. Volume II, in 6 issues. **Northwestern Publishing House**, Milwaukee, Wis.

Price: 40 Cts. the booklet.

The first volume of this dogmatics will deal with the Prolegomena and will appear later. The present second volume offers on 482 pages the theology and anthropology. The "Theology" is treated in the following sections: of the knowledge of God, of the existence of God, of God's nature and attributes, of the Trinity of God, of the works of God, of the angels. Anthropology treats of man's origin and state of corruption from the following points of view: The nature of man in general, the state of innocence, corruption and sin in general, guilt, punishment, the Fall, original sin, original guilt, properties of original sin, actual sin, hardening, temporal death, free will. Reserving the actual discussion of this work for another time, we leave two quotations for the preliminary characterization of the theological position of the same. Of the **voluntas antecedens et consequens** Hönecke says (p. 130): "It is well known that this distinction of **voluntas antecedens et consequens** is the main foundation from which rests the incorrect doctrine of election to grace of the later Lutheran theologians, such as Gerhard, Quenstedt, and others. It is somewhat alarming that the Semipelagians and later the Socinians and Arminians operated with this distinction. This is explicable. For if this division is really to do anything to make spiritual processes, e. g. in conversion, intelligible, or to throw light on mysteries such as the why of the conversion of one and the non-conversion of another, the why of the election of one and the non-election of another, one must find Pelagian and Synergistic things included in it. And this is what those sectarians found, who are all representatives of Pelagianism and Synergism. Only in the synergistic sense does this distinction do anything for doctrinal design, and then for the design of incorrect doctrine." From the section dealing with the free will of the natural man (p. 476), "Man in the state of corruption does not ask after God (Rom. 3:11)-how can there be desire for conversion in him? The mind of the flesh is enmity against God (Rom. 8, 7; Col. 1, 21) - how will it humble itself under God? The natural man understands nothing of the spirit of God (1 Cor. 2, 14); the deep spiritual sense of the law is already hidden from him, and every bit of the divine truth of the gospel is completely hidden, incomprehensible, even foolishness. How, then, will he rightly recognize his sin and sinfulness, how will he gain even the slightest knowledge of Christ, how, then, will he make even the slightest beginning toward conversion? These considerations alone show that man's **liberum arbitrium is** utterly useless in all matters pertaining to conversion. In addition to this, Scripture denies to the natural man the least spiritually good thought (2 Cor. 3:5) and declares it impossible to accept Jesus without the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3); cf. Meisner, who therefore draws the right conclusion from all this that the natural man **non vult, nec velle potest se ad Deum convertere**. This inability is also taught in passages that generally indicate the corrupt nature of the natural man, calling him flesh, the complete opposite of spirit (Joh. 3, 6), saying of him that he only does evil (Matth. 7, 18; Luk. 6, 43. 44; Col. 1, 21), that he is dead in spiritual things (Eph. 2, 1; Col. 2, 13; Joh. 5, 25; Matth. 8, 22). Flesh and spirit are perfect opposites. Luther: One must have respect for this: Where the word flesh is used in Scripture in such a way that it is held to be against the Spirit, flesh is called everything that is radically contrary to God's Spirit/ If the natural man is thus flesh, he cannot perform **actiones spirituales, that** is, be converted; if he is evil through and through, he cannot even have the good that he desires his conversion. In all these scriptural passages there is sufficient proof that the natural man's **liberum arbitrium** contains no powers of conversion, that he is incapable of this spiritual work according to knowledge as well as will. Strictly speaking, here, where it is a question of the powers of the natural man with respect to conversion, the full Scriptural proof is given by the above and related passages. But even here, to complete the proof, the dogmatists usually add the passages of Scripture which

deny the ability of conversion to the natural man by declaring conversion to be God's work alone (Ezek. 36, 26; Jer. 32, 39; Deut. 5, 29, 4; Eph. 1, 17; 2, 5; 4, 7; Apost. 26, 18; 2 Cor. 4, 6; Phil. 1, 6; 2, 13); cf. **Form. Conc**. Hence the well-known sentence of Calov: **Homo ad sui conversionem nihil confert aut 'conferre potest, . . sed mere passive se habet.**"

F. B.

**"Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."** A complete volume of sermons (80) on free texts by **Lic. theol. Dr. phil**. Johann Rump. 1st volume. Hinstorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Price (hardback): M. 8.50.

From 423 pages (10X6½), this first volume offers 40 sermons for the first Sunday of Advent through Pentecost Monday, covering the following topics and texts: "1. .Daughter of Zion, rejoice greatly, and you, daughter of Jerusalem, exult; behold, your King is coming to you!' First Advent, on Mark. 1, 1-8. 2. .Truly this is the prophet who is to come into the world.' Second Advent, on Acts. 3, 22-26. 3. The question about Christ and its answer. Third Advent, on Joh. 1, 24-29. 4. How all Advent from earth wants to help prepare the return of the Lord. Fourth Advent, about Apost. 3, 19-21. 5. Behold, what love God shows us! First Christmas Day, about Joh. 3, 16. 6. About the glory of the Christmas child. Second day of Christmas, about Joh. 1, 14. 7. How the blessing of Bethlehem is shown to a disciple who has really experienced Christmas. Sunday after Christmas (December 27), on Apost. 6, 8-15 and 7, 55-59. 8. .Behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the age!' New Year's Eve, on Matth. 28, 20. '9. How we can prove ourselves as JEsu's disciples in the new year. New Year's Day, on Luk. 14, 28-33. 10. What the LORD says about unbelief. Sunday after New Year, on Joh. 12, 44-50. 11. How the mission is called to be an Epiphany messenger of the Exalted One. Epiphany (January 6), mission festival sermon in Berlin on Joh. 12, 20-23. 12. How we can learn from the Lord to do God's will. First Sunday after Epiphany, about Matth. 4, 12-17. 13. Why so many people do not come to faith. Second Sunday after Epiphany, about Matth. 13, 53-58. 14. What you can experience with the Lord. Third Sunday after Epiphany, about Matth. 4, 18-25. 15. How the Lord stood by the word of God of the old covenant. Fourth Sunday after Epiphany, about Matth. 5, 17-19. 16. How disciples of Jesus should behave in suffering. Fifth Sunday after Epiphany, on Mark 8, 22-26. 17. How the Gospel is to be preached to all men. Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, on Apost. 13, 42-52. 18. In what sense the Lord has brought something entirely new. Sunday Septuagesimä, about Matth. 9, 14-17. 19. Three basic laws of JEsu for evangelical youth associations and their members. Sunday Sexagesimä, sermon in Allstedt (S. W.) about Joh. 12, 24-26. 20. About the mystery of the cross. Sunday Quinquagesimä (Estomihi), about Mark. 8, 27-33. 21. "This is the King of the Jews! Sunday Invocavit, on Luk 23, 32-38. 22. Three crosses! Sunday Reminiscere, on Luk. 23; 39-43. 23. How the dying Lord joins His own. Sunday Oculi, on Joh. 19, 25-27. 24. "Hail to me a thousand times, who ever loved me! Sunday Lätare (sermon at a young people's association celebration on Paul Gerhardt's memorial day), about Joh. 13, 33-35. 25. About the miracle of JEsu's death. Sunday Lätare, about Matth. 27, 45-47. 26. What the fifth word of JEsu on the cross tells us. Sunday Judica, about Joh. 19, 28. 29. 27. What was accomplished from Golgotha! Sunday Palmarum, about Joh. 19, 30a. 28. the last farewell of the dying Redeemer! Good Friday, Luk 23, 46. 29. What JEsu's faithful experienced when it became Easter for the first time. Easter Sunday, Luk. 24, 1-12. 30. How only Jesus Himself gives the true joy of Easter. Easter Monday, about Matth. 28, 8-10. 31. "Do you also want to go away? Sunday Quasimodogeniti, at the beginning of catechumen and confirmation classes, on Joh. 6, 66-71. 32. What identifies the Lord as the Saviour of men. Sunday Misericordias Domini, about Joh. 10, 1-11. 33. What instruction the Lord gave His disciples for their conduct in the world. Sunday Jubilate, about Matth. 10, 16-22. 34. How faith in Jesus is desired and blessed by God. Sunday Cantate, about Joh. 6, 35-40. 35. Pray

you still? Sunday Rogate, about Luk. 18, 1-8. 36. What the Lord taught His disciples before His ascension. Ascension Day, about Apost. 1, 4-12. 37. Where it comes to right mission work. Sermon at the Ascension Feast in Arsten-Bremen about Luk 14, 15. 38. How the disciples approached Pentecost. Sunday Exaudi, on Apost. 1, 13-26. 39. What it is about the spirit of Pentecost. Sunday Pentecost, on Joh. 14, 16. 17. 40. To whom Pentecost gives something, and what it gives. Pentecost Monday, on John 7:37-39." From these themes it is evident that Rump does not want to be a liberal preacher in order to bring to so-called "modern men" a gospel from which the vexation of the deity of Christ and the atonement through His death on the cross is eliminated. Rump preaches the old truths of the second article. Consistently pure in doctrine, however, these sermons of Rump are not. Especially in the doctrine of the origin of faith Rump goes astray, in that he traces faith back to the honest resolution and earnest seeking of man, and thus drops the **sola gratia** in conversion. F. B.

Spain today under the yoke of the papacy. By Padre Don Jose Ferrandiz. Authorized translation by Don Ibero. Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, Frankfurt a. M. Price: M. 3.50.

In this book Ferrandiz describes the pernicious influence of the papacy with its countless priests, monks and nuns on the Spanish people in political, economic and moral terms. "Whoever wants to get to know the papacy must observe it in countries where it can rule and reign without limits. Only there does it show its true face." Such a country is Spain. And Ferrandiz now traces the tortuous, secret passages by which the Romanists have subjugated the Spanish people. He writes: "My intention is to use the example of Spain, whose economic, spiritual, and moral misery is not yet sufficiently known outside, to prove what is the fate of a people that comes under the tyrannical rule of the Papacy, and what a state of disease must afflict a nation that allows itself to be infected by Roman **leprosy.**" In America, as is well known, the Roman Church poses as the guardian of marriage and the family. Of Spain, however, Ferrandiz says: "The Church establishes marriage unions and separates them again, according as it seems advantageous to its purposes. Family life has become a concept without value or meaning. From every corner of the house lurks the spectre of the Fraile (religious). Where the Fraile has not yet recovered an entrance, he knows how to gain it by a simple means. For the service agency rests everywhere in the hands of clerical agencies. The maid or cook who finds lodging in the new house is ost nothing but a tool of pfäffian espionage. No secret is safe within the four walls of the home any longer." Priests who leave the Roman Church to enter into marriage are refused marriage by the registrars because they cannot produce a papal dispensation. Civil marriage, established by law, was abolished in 1874, with retroactive crast. If either of the two civilly wedded wished to become free again, the marriage was unceremoniously dissolved. "This was a measure imposed by the Vatican, prompted by the fact that a number of Catholic clergymen had converted to Protestantism and then married in civil wedlock. If one now wished to bring these back into the clerical state, which in the case of several actually succeeded, one had first to remove the obstacle which in this respect the priest's lawful wife offered." Of the morals of priests, Ferrandiz says: "During the thirty years of priestly career which have weighed upon me, I must have known more than ten thousand clergymen. Of only four can I say that they have lived truly chaste, sober, righteous, and obedient to the commandments of the Church." Of the 20 million inhabitants of Spain, 250,000 belong to the clergy, so that there is one person of the Church for every eighty souls. And the majority of the high clergy, according to Ferrandiz, are composed of atheists, sceptics, and deists, who regard their profession merely as a means of gainful employment. "The Catholic boycott is the general and the everywhere, especially in the provinces.effective, never failing remedy. There it is said, between submission to the Church.

-of discredit and civil death." " Torture is still used in the convents, innocent people are thrown into gaol and tortured." "If you are not a believing Catholic, but your child, who has just died, has secretly received baptism as a result of the influence exerted by the priest on the mother, then the priest will snatch the body of your child from you, give it an ecclesiastical burial, and on top of that sue you for the costs before the judge, who ought really to punish the priest by law. " But Ferrandiz has not yet recognized the real ruin of the papacy. Luther writes: "This piece shows clearly that he (the pope) is the true end-Christ or anti-Christ, who has set himself above and against Christ and exalted himself, because he does not want to make Christians blessed without his authority, which is not, however, ordered or commanded by God ." Spa- nia can only become truly free from the bondage of the pope when it has recognized that man becomes righteous and blessed before God without pope, priest and obedience to the church, solely through faith in Christ. F. B.

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D. D., LL. D. By *Adolph Spaeth,* D. D., LL. D. Two Volumes. General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. , Price: P3.50.

The first volume of this biography was published by "**The Christian Literature Company**" in 1898, and is sold separately for H1.75 plus 16 Cts. Postage. It affords a portrait of Krauth, and describes the period of his life from 1823 to 1859, in the following chapters:- "**1. Ancestors. Rev. Charles Philip Krauth**, D. D. 1797-1867. **2. Childhood, College, and Seminary Life. 1823-1841. 3. Beginning in Canton. 1841-1842. 4. Pastorate in Baltimore. 1842-1847. 5. The Synod of Maryland. Essay on The Real Presence. 1842-1845. 6. Shepherdstown and Martinsburg. Winches**ter, Va. 1847-1852. 7. St. Thomas and Santa Cruz. 1852-1853. 8. Winchester to Pittsburg. 1853-1859. 9. Relation to the General Synod up to the Year 1859." The second volume was published the previous year by the General Council Publication House, and cost separately $1.75 plus 14 cts. Postage. It describes Krauth's life from 1859 to 1883 in the following chapters, "10. Pastorate in St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia. 1859-1861. 11. Editor of *The Lutheran and Missionary*. 1860-1867. 12. The National Crisis. 1860-1865. 13. The Literary Controversy against American Lutheranism. 1861-1867. 14. The Crisis in the General Synod. 1864-1867. 15. The General Council. 1867-1880. 16. Professor of Philosophy and Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. 1868-1883. 17. Literary Activity During the Decade. 1871-1881. 18. Journey to Europe, and Luther-Biography. 19. the End. 1881-1883." Then follows a list of Krauth's publications and a detailed index. The account is a lively one, and everywhere engages the lively interest of the reader. D. Späth achieves this primarily by allowing Krauth himself to speak wherever possible. In the preface Späth remarks: "For it was the writer's aim to make this Memoir as nearly an autobiography as possible. Each chapter gives first, in a brief outline, the history of that particular period of his life, and then presents the material itself on which the account is based, in extracts from letters and other sources." This also explains the significant size of the book. Also, D. Späth often goes further and uses much interesting material, especially concerning the doctrinal position of the General Synod. As far as D. Krauth himself is concerned, he went through many fluctuations, and he did not reach a completely clear and firm position on all points of doctrine that had become controversial within the Lutheran Church in America, even in his later years. Theologically he shares the position of the General Council, whose main fault from the beginning was: indecisiveness in the fights for Lutheran doctrine and practice, indecisiveness which had its reason in lack of clarity, indifferentism and occasionally also in fears of cleverness. And that this deficiency of Krauth's theological position and of the General Council has not been brought into the light, therein lies also the main fault of the biography before us. Characteristic is also the fact that Krauth publicly raised his voice in the election controversy.

has not let himself be heard. It was only after his death that a short, obviously immature piece of writing by Krauth was published, which does not express the scriptural and symbolic doctrine of the election of grace, but also lacks a decisive statement pro or contra on all sides. Krauth was held in very high esteem by Walther, who in his death notice of him writes: "Was the blessed man without doubt the most eminent man in the English Lutheran Church of this country, a man of rare learning, no less at home in the old than in the new theology, and the main thing, heartily devoted to the pure doctrine of our Church as he had known it, a noble man without falsehood. In former times a general synodist in doctrine and practice, he came to a different conviction by the grace of God, and in the ***Lutheran and Missionary of*** July 13, 1865, he made the following open declaration: 'To true unity of the church agreement in fundamentals is necessary, and an essential part of what is necessary is an agreement as to what belongs to fundamentals.' The doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession are all articles of faith, and all articles of faith are fundamental. Our church can never have true inward harmony except in the confession of these articles, and of all of them altogether, without reservation or equivocation. This is our deep conviction, and we hereby solemnly **retract** before God and his Church, as we have already earnestly and repeatedly done in an indirect manner, all that we have written or said in conflict with this our present conviction. This to do, we are not ashamed. We thank God, who has led us to see the truth, uttd we thank him that he has freed us from the temptation to entangle ourselves with the claim that we have remained completely true to ourselves in regard to our former, thoroughly sincere, yet respectively exceedingly immature views even to this day/ As those everywhere, As the fruit of his continued fearless and clear testimony and untiring work, especially within the English Lutheran Church, which is visible everywhere, especially in the circle of his effectiveness, is the lasting inheritance which he left to it on his departure from the contending church, so at the same time he has left with that retraction, as once Augustine did, an imperishable monument of the sincerity of his conviction." In the ***Lutheran Observer of*** January 12, 1883, an admirer of D. Krauth wrote: "I once questioned his (Dr. Krauth's) venerable father about this great change" (in his son's theological position). "'His answer' was: as far as he knew, the turning point had occurred when he had given his 'Karl' - as he always tenderly called him - a copy of Chemnitz." This is also interesting in connection with D. Späth's remark that P. Wyneken had asked Krauth to translate Chemnitz's **Examen** into English as an antidote to the Roman pretensions. F. B.

**History of Philosophy in** a Clear Presentation. By Prof. Dr. Adolf Mannheimer. Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, Frankfurt a. M. Price: M. 4.50.

This work is divided into three parts, of which the first offers the philosophy of the ancient world, the Indians and Greeks, on 111 pages together with a longer introduction, the second part deals with the philosophy up to Kant on 115 pages, and the third part presents the philosophy from Kant to the present on 287 pages. The author's point of view is not the Christian one, but that of the New Idealism, to the initiation of which his book intends to contribute. The presentation is one of common understanding. F. B.

**THE FUNDAMENTALS. A Testimony of the Truth. Vol. I. Compliments of Two Christian Laymen. Testimony Publishing Company, 808 La Salle Ave, Chicago, Ill**.

This writing, which is sent free of charge to all pastors, teachers, etc., contains 123 pages of seven articles, in which a front is made against the modern unbelief, which denies Jesus' virgin birth, deity and reconciliation, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the miracles, etc. The theologians who speak here and who also give the writing a Reformed character are J. Orr, Warfield, Campbell Morgan, Torrell, Pierson, Hayne and doctor Kelly. The theologians who speak here and give the Scriptures a reformed character are J. Orr, Warfield, Campbell Morgan, Torrey, Pierson, Hayne and the physician Kelly.

F. B.

We have received a copy **from A. Deichert's publishing house in Leipzig:**

1. "The Historical Jesus, the Mythological Christ, and Jesus the Christian." A critical walk through the modern version of Jesus by K. Dunkmann. (M. 1.80.) 3. "Modern Ideals of Preaching." Contributions to the theory of contemporary preaching according to content and form by Die. Alfred Uckeley. (M.1.40.)

**H. Helmkes Verlag in Hildesheim** sent us:

"Main Currents in the History of the Protestant Church." Three lectures delivered at the Society of Friends of the "Kirchliche Gegenwart" at Hildesheim by Die. Rolffs, Director Die. Gastrow, and L. Grethen. (60 Pf.)

**B. G. Teubners Verlag in Leipzig** sent us:

Science and Religion in the Philosophy of Our Time" by Emile Boutroux. Translated into German by E. Weber. (M. 6.) 2. "Christianity and World History up to the Reformation. The Origin of Christianity and its Development as a Church." By Dr. Karl Sell. (M.1.28.) 3. "Christianity and World History since the Reformation. Christianity in its development beyond the Church." By Dr. Karl Sell. (M.1.25.)

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**From the Ohio Synod**. Concerning the unionist conferences between General Synodists, Conciliates, and Ohioans, the ***Standard*** also declares (p. 598): "**The exercise of greater caution was recommended, both with regard to the meetings and the reports of them in our church-papers. The spirit of unionism is contagious, and reports too optimistic are misleading and give offense**. "The Ohio papers have hitherto been very liberal with the charge of dishonesty against Missouri. How they prove this accusation is evident, for example, from the "Theologische ZeitRättern" (29, p. 47), where we read: "In comparison with the Missourians, one must in some respects give credit to the Wisconsiners for their openness and honesty. Whereas, for example, the Missourians have still not been able to bring themselves to express themselves in any way on the Norwegian Unification Theses (see 'Zeitblätter' 1908, p. 228 ff.), the Wisconsins have done so and rejected them as wrong." Anyone who has read "Lehre und Wehre" knows that the above assertion, on which the "Zeitblätter" impugn the honesty of the Missourians, is false. First, then, the "Zeitblätter" make an untrue assertion, and then, by means of a logically questionable consequence, they draw from this untruth the accusation of dishonesty! 3 Let there follow here a likewise untrue assertion, which shows how the Ohioans use even trifling things to agitate in a low manner against Missouri. The "Church Newspaper" of February 12 of this year, in a review of Gerike's "refutation" of the Missourians, remarks: "Their principle is: Never read what the opponent writes - if you can somehow escape it. So also some time ago - and probably still today - all kinds of other church papers were before the seminarians in St. Louis for reading, but from Ohio - nothing. Why? **Like dyna mite - too dangerous**." Another logically fallacious episode, built on falsehood to boot! Mpral: Who cares about a caricature of Missouri?

let him diligently read the Ohio papers. This is especially true of the presentation of the Missouri doctrine of election by grace in the Ohio "Church Newspaper. When we read the above and similar untrue and unjust accusations, Luther's words to Erasmus came to mind: "To be praised deceives and frightens him, but to the blasphemies of his enemies he owes life, joy and a great part of his confidence. 5. The Columbus ***Columbus Magazine*** writes (29, 338): "**The thing to be determined when Christians are carrying on a controversy is then what do the Scriptures teach. This settled, the controversy is at an end. . . . When once a Lutheran knows that the Lord has spoken it, he submits without any further questions or conditions.**" Were the Ohioans to approach Eph. 1 in this spirit, for example, they would soon be in agreement with Missouri. But where would that leave their theory of the analogy of faith, and of harmony with the system established by their theologians? At Marburg Luther said to the Swiss, "As ye will not be bent by our text, so we will not be bent by your interpretations." This is also an accurate characterization of the theological situation between Missouri and Ohio. Clear Bible passages make no impression on Ohioans and Ohioan interpretations make no impression on Missouri. 6. On April 9, D. Allwardt at the age of 70. The Ohio "Church Newspaper" praises his polemics against Missourians, with whom "he still had an ostrich to the last." That Allwardt railed against Missouri with much pathos is certain. But it was a zeal with folly, and a struggle neither for truth nor with truth. The ***Lutheran World*** writes: "**He used his pen with telling effect against Missouri**." But yet only to synergists or readers who did not watch him. If you want to convince yourself of this, read, for example, B. Gerike's "Refutation." F. B.

**Two Institutions -of the General Synod and the Carnegie Foundation.** In the official report of last year on the "Carnegie Foundation", p. 4 f., besides several Methodist and other schools, two institutions of the General Synod, Wittenberg and Pennsylvania Colleges, are listed as having received support. Yes, the report of the "Carnegie Foundation" leads the reader to believe that also' President Hechert of Wittenberg College and President Hefelbower of Pennsylvania College, with the other college presidents, submitted to the Carnegie Committee a paper expressing thoughts amounting to a complete denial of Lutheranism. The report of the "Carnegie Foundation" reads: "In addition to the proceedings taken in these matters, the executive committee conferred during the year with two deputations, one composed of the presidents of a number of colleges which are associated in legal ties with religious organizations, the other consisting of representatives from the governing board of a college upon the accepted list. The former group of gentlemen were introduced to the committee by President Louis E. Holden of the University of Wooster (Presbyterian Church in the United States of America), and consisted of President Emory W. Hunt of Denison University (Baptist Churches of the Northern Convention) ; Professor Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College (Religious Society of Friends); President William F. Pierce of Kenyon College (Protestant Episcopal Church); President Herbert Welch of Ohio Wesleyan University (Methodist Episcopal Church).

copal Church); President Willis E. Parsons of Parsons College (Presbyterian Church in the United States of America); President Charles E. Miller of Heidelberg University (Reformed Church in the United States); President Thomas H. McMichael of Monmouth College (United Presbyterian Church); *President Charles G. Hechert of Wittenberg College (Lutheran Church, General Synod); President S. G. Hefelbower of Pennsylvania College (Lutheran Church, General Synod);* President John S. Nollen of Lake Forest College (Presbyterian Church in the United States of America); President Frederick William Boatwright of Richmond College (Baptist Churches of the Southern Convention); and President William H. P. Faunce of Brown University (Baptist Churches of the Northern Convention). These gentlemen presented to the executive committee the following memorial: *'Memorial to the President and Executive Committee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching on Behalf of Certain Colleges Hitherto Excluded from the Benefits of the Foundation:-* In the letter announcing his munificent Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Mr. Andrew Carnegie excluded from the benefits of the Foundation such colleges "as are under the control of a sect, or require trustees (or a majority thereof), officers, faculty, or students, to belong to any specified sect, or which impose any theological test." The principle involved in this declaration we heartily approve. The spirit of sectarianism we recognize to be essentially incompatible with the ideals of a liberal education. The evident purpose of the donor was to exclude only institutions that are now sectarian in spirit and teaching, since he recognized clearly that many institutions "established long ago were truly sectarian, but to-day are free to all men of all creeds, or of none," and stated that such are "not to be considered sectarian now." The valuable investigations instituted by the Foundation have revealed the fact that many institutions are excluded from the benefits of the Foundation solely because of charter provisions regulating the choice of trustees. We are convinced that these institutions, notwithstanding such provisions with regard to the choice of trustees, are in no true sense sectarian. The sectarian spirit against which Mr. Carnegie wished to guard we conceive to be *that which limits academic freedom, by imposing a denominational test in the selection of teachers or by warping administrative policy*. ... We believe that in any case technical provisions in historic charters that are found to be in actual practice not a bar to complete liberty and autonomy should not operate to exclude institutions from the benefits of the Foundation.'" The 1909 General Synod report makes no mention of the move by the two General Synod institutions mentioned in the Carnegie report. And the *Lutheran World of* March 30, 1910, also speaks of the 'Carnegie Foundation' in a way that makes a submission like the above from General Synod seem highly unlikely. And yet 'the passage quoted above is in the Carnegie Report. The representatives of General Synod should not, therefore, fail to make a statement to that effect. If the statements of the Carnegie Report are not false and misleading, but in accordance with the facts, then Lutheranism has been denied by the presidents of the institutions mentioned in a way to which the General Synod must not remain silent.

F. B.

Religious instruction in the state schools. The Protestant magazine believes it can refute the assertion that the state is not responsible for religious education with the following thoughts: "Paul writes: 'There is no authority without from God'. This means, then, that the state has its right to exist and its authority from God. A' state, therefore, which persistently shows itself indifferent with regard to the religious training of the adolescent sex, thereby denies the authority from which it derives its existence, it disestablishes itself, undermines its own authority, and commits a crime of majesty against its own Lord." But here is presupposed just what should be proved, namely, that God has commanded the state to see to it that God's word shall be taught and acknowledged by the people. Of course we have nothing against it if the state gives such children, who want to attend religious instruction somewhere, an afternoon or several afternoons a week free for this purpose. But the state has neither the vocation nor the right to set up religious instruction itself or to force churches or parents to do so. And if it nevertheless arrogates to itself this right, then the beginning of tyranny of conscience is made, which means the downfall of the free church as well as of the free state. F. B.

**Conditions in the Pope's Church**. The ***Western Watchman of*** St. Louis, a stock Catholic paper, gives the following testimony to his Church, according to the "Messenger of Peace": "The greatest problem confronting the (Catholic) Church in the United States today is this: What is she to do with her young men? All the other problems we have dealt with successfully; but that problem is still unsolved. Our young men are going to ruin; our Catholic young men are often the worst in the country. In every large city in the United States the Catholic young men are the worst in the city, and the Irish Catholic young men are the very worst of all. Ask the police, read the newspapers; they all tell the same sad story. The young lawbreakers in St. Louis and every other American city have Irish Catholic names for the most part. Take, for instance, all the notorious 'gangs' in this city, and you will find that they are largely composed of boys who are children of Irish Catholic parents." What a raw, savage spirit it is that the *Western Watchman* himself cultivates is also evident from the following words of his: "These big, fat Catholic hogs lie in bed on Sunday morning, and you could not with a pitchfork wake them up to go to mass. Irish Catholic hogs lie in bed on Sunday morning when mass is going on here. . . And this parish and every other parish in St. Louis is full of these Catholic hogs, who sleep and grunt and roll on Sunday morning, but cannot be stirred up to go to mass. And the Catholic women are pretty near as bad." That Catholic laity should put up with such treatment is a testimony to the slave-mindedness which the Papal Church raises. F. B.

## J. . Abroad.

**"Elementary School Law and Religious Instruction in Saxony."** Under this heading we read in the Saxon "Free Church": "Since year and day the school children of our Leipzig congregation have received their religious instruction regularly from the pastor of the congregation and therefore also

had been exempted from religious instruction in the elementary schools in accordance with the law on elementary schools, suddenly in November of last year the Leipzig school authorities made a move against the existing legal conditions and demanded that our children also participate again in religious instruction in the elementary school, on the grounds that the law permitted the giving of religious instruction for the benefit of our community, but did not authorize the exemption of the children from state religious instruction. Not even a dispensation of the children concerned from religious instruction in the elementary school could be obtained until a decision of the high Royal Ministry of Culture. Thus the board of the Leipzig congregation sent a letter of complaint to the aforementioned ministry with the request that the matter be expedited, since it was a matter of conscience. That was on December 8, 1909. Now, on March 2, 1910, the decision, which the Ministry had already issued on January 29, was received by the complainant board from the Royal District School Inspectorate Leipzig I. The children in question had to spend three months at the school. Thus the children in question had to attend the religious instruction of the elementary school unlawfully for three months, at last even one month after the issuance of the decision by the Royal Ministry of Culture, despite the fact that by decree of the Ministry of Culture each of our Saxon communities is guaranteed the right to its own religious instruction. This is proof of 'religious freedom' in Saxony. Above all, however, it shows what the teachers want: to impose their 'religion' on all children." The decision of the Ministry of Culture, which is favorable to our brethren, declares: "On the other hand, the Ministry cannot consider further action against the school children in question and their parents to be permissible. For according to § 6, paragraph 2 of the Volksschulgesetz of April 26, 1873, the children of members of the confessional minorities are exempt from religious instruction in the Volksschule without further ado. The law leaves the school authorities no leeway to make this exemption dependent on conditions. Whether the religious instruction of such children in their own confession is sufficient, is decided according to the law solely by the representation of the religious society concerned." God keep his protecting hand over our fellow believers in Germany! F. B.

Concerning the **position of the late D. von Zezschwitz on the Lord's Supper,** the "H. P. K." brings an extract from the report of the XII General Pastoral Conference of Evangelical Lutheran Clergymen of Bavaria, held at Erlangen on June 14 and 16, 1882. Von Zezschwitz said here: "It has been asserted by Inspector Wangemann that I am **nudging the** Uniate students, especially members of the Prussian State Church, from the altar among our student youth. This is a falsehood. ... I may calmly appeal to my listeners whether I am an ecclesiastical zealot to whom the boundary of brotherly consciousness is set with the boundary of the denominational church. They know that my main endeavor is to learn in purely historical objectivity also from every faction that may still be called the Church of Christ. After that you will assume from the outset that this is not my practice of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, I can be sure of your agreement that the Lord's Supper is not recommended to our personal love. The Lord's Supper belongs to the confessing church, as long as the divorce into confessing and professing churches remains.

nis churches. I am in my office under the Faculty, or Senate, and would feel responsible if I denied Lutheran principles. So far I may say, and he may appear who could call this untrue, that even if it led to a different end, and a dear young friend who applied and declared to me quite simply that he wished to persevere in the Uniate view with regard to the Lord's Supper, had to leave and was not accepted, we are still parted as friends and brothers. And I think that wherever this question is treated in the right pastoral sense, this could be achieved at all. There are Lutherans in the Union, much as that expression is in doubt, according to the confession quite undoubtedly. There are whole provinces in Prussia and congregations which are Lutheran according to their origin, and in their practice are still to-day in part more strictly Lutheran led and accustomed to be led than are many a Landeskirch congregation. Whoever comes to me and asks for the sacrament, I will put the chair in front of him right from the start? On the contrary; I am rather stupid at it. - We still have the registration here. When a Prussian comes among five or six dear young friends, it is very difficult for me to ask him: 'Stay there alone for a few moments.' Then I ask him, 'How do you stand on the Union, and how will you hold it in office with the practice of the Lord's Supper?' For surely it would be terrible if the national boundary should matter in itself. . . . Whoever declares to me that as long as God preserves his faith at all, he will bear witness against false union, even in practice, I will calmly let him go to the sacrament. That is sufficient for my confessional views. It is not only the doctrinal concept that is to be followed. The enjoyment of the sacrament is not merely a matter of doctrine. Otherwise I would have to examine the gentlemen on the **manducatio oralis** and on the communion of the unworthy. I don't think that's proper. I put it to the practical question: 'What is your personal attitude to the Union according to your faith?' I cannot demand of a student that he agree to resign from his national church; but I must have the liberty to ask whether he wishes to exercise his Lutheran stand in the Union by testifying against all Union which weakens the confession in its foundation. This is our practice." The interest of "H. P. K." is to prove that the "General Lutheran Conference" has ever and ever been in church fellowship with the Union Lutherans. F. B.

As the "Mecklenb. Kirchen- und Zeitbl." reports, the Rostock clergy were invited to **the dedication of the newly built Roman Catholic Christuskirche in** Rostock, and several of them, including the superintendent, accepted the invitation. The service lasted over an hour. The reporter of the mentioned paper, who was also among the celebrating clergymen, praised the sermon of the bishop, which had an "edifying and uplifting" effect, and noted towards the end of his report on the celebration: "It was a pleasure for me to be able to participate in the celebration. When I took leave of the venerable bishop, I could only express my thanks to him that I had been able to take part in this beautiful feast, and express the hope and the wish that also on that side" (which, as is well known, curses those who want to become blessed solely by grace for the sake of Christ) "many will be led to our Lord Jesus".

may." And such "clergy" still call themselves "Lutheran"! Should one still have been in doubt as to the state of Lutheranism in the Mecklenburg Regional Church, this disgraceful trip to Rome must dispel all doubts. (E. L. F.)

**The "Sächsische Schulzeitung" refers for** its disbelief to the following godly pronouncement of the Reformed Father D. Kautzsch in Saxony on the second article: "With this piece of the Apostolic we are no longer on the ground of historical reality as with the words: suffered, crucified, died, buried, but rather in the realm of the mythological poetry of a time that has perished for us with its threefold divided world: the realm of the dead, the earth, the heaven. If for that time Hollen- and Himmelfahrt was a necessity, today many are indifferent to it. To many it is incomprehensible, to many downright offensive. 'Descended into hell,' better translated, descended into the realm of the dead; a hell in many senses as a place of chastisement is not meant. The phrase is interpreted as if Jesus had used the Hades sojourn to preach a sermon of punishment or salvation to pre-Noachite humanity. Jesus, as a child of his time, was probably convinced that after his death he would have to go to the underworld like all other people. But to place the descensus in the work of salvation are thoughts of a later Christianity. 'Risen from the dead.' There is no mention of a bodily resurrection either in Paul or in the first words of Jesus. According to the oldest reporter, Paul, Jesus' earthly body remained in the grave and decayed and his soul entered into new life. The Gospels have sensualized and coarsened the visions, and so the spiritual resurrection has become, in the faith of the church, a bodily one. 'Ascended into heaven.' At one time the ascension is after forty days, at another it falls on the day of the resurrection. The forty days seem to be interpolated to make room for the visions. 'Sitting at the right hand of God', with the later addition: 'of the Father Almighty'. This phrase is traceable to the 110th Psalm. What is there said of one Maccabee is later applied to Christ. 'From then he will come to judge the living and the dead.' The hope of His return was undoubtedly expressed by Jesus in several places. It was a strong belief of his day. With all fervour his generation clung to it. It has been mistaken like Jesus himself." If a Reformed pastor preached like this, why shouldn't the state teachers be allowed to recite such things to the children in the schools! So argue the liberal teachers in Saxony, from whom modern theology has evidently robbed not only faith, but also common sense.

**The Teachers' Group of the Lutheran School Association in Saxony**, which comprises 230 teachers, has declared its support for the following resolution: "The resolutions of the Representative Assembly of the Saxon Teachers' Association of January 3 and 4, 1910, have in some respects considerably intensified the Zwickau demands with regard to the reorganization of religious instruction. The undersigned committees feel urged to openly express their dissenting opinion on this matter. 1) Religious education cannot only have the task of bringing the faith of Jesus to life in the children, but it also has the duty to teach the youth the faith of Jesus Christ.

To lead the children to Jesus Christ, our God-human Saviour. (2) Scheduled religious instruction may not be given only from the fifth school year onward, and in only two hours per week, but must begin in the first school year. The time to be devoted to instruction shall be three half-hours a week in the first and second years, two hours a week in the third and fourth years, three hours a week in the fifth and sixth years, and four hours a week in the seventh and eighth years. (3) Religious instruction shall not be guided by the current trends of the times, but shall be evaluated according to the religious and moral requirements of Holy Scripture. The catechism of Luther is to be treated separately and in a preparatory manner in the teaching of the upper grades, namely in the fifth and sixth grades following the biblical historical material, but in a concluding manner in the seventh and eighth grades. The detailed discussion of the sacraments is to be assigned to the church's confirmation classes. 5. The selection of the memorandum material adopted by the Assembly of Representatives proves to be such a significant shortening or alteration of the previous memorandum material that it is unacceptable to the undersigned, especially because it completely eliminates the redemptive work of Jesus and thus the most essential part of the Lutheran Confession.

**An excellent testimony was given** at the teachers' meeting in Bielefeld. Teacher Strangmeier said in a lecture on Matth. 11, 25-30 among other things: "To be the great one and only schoolmaster's henchman, that is our dignity, but also our burden. That is why we work with bound marches and have to carry out the plan that JEsu has in mind with regard to the children. This plan is simple and clear: all, including the children, are to come to JEsu and take his yoke upon themselves. Many parents and educators deviate from this plan. The art of education, according to them, consists only in the development and guidance of the impulsive germs of humanity through clear knowledge of the good and the beautiful. Beside this great multitude, in all classes, even among teachers, there is a small group who joyfully profess Christ, the only begotten Son of God. The greatest thing about Christ is what is written in John 1:14. Even if the most brilliant representatives of modern theology say that this is unimportant, that Jesus' words and deeds of helping love are the essential things, this makes no impression on believing Christians, for they have experienced Jesus. The way to him leads through repentance. It is the fulfillment of the longing of a human heart. This longing is also present in children. To give it direction toward JEsum is the dignity and burden of the teacher." A second teacher, in his lecture on what to make of the demand that religious instruction should not be dogmatic, said in effect: "The struggle against the dogmatic character of religious instruction is basically nothing other than a struggle against the confession of the facts of salvation itself. The words in the second Zwickau thesis: 'Religious instruction has the task of making the mind of Jesus alive in the child,' are only a phrase. In the religious instruction of these moderns, the miracle has no place; it is not religious instruction at all, but only moral instruction." At the teachers' meeting in Unna the infamous Zwickau theses were condemned.

**Bezzel says in a confidential letter to the Bavarian pastors:** "I deeply deplore that the church should become a school of philosophy and its ministers critics, since they are allowed to be stewards over and in secrets, the administration of which does not make them unfree nor unpious, but in pure loyalty allows them glorious freedom and blessed breadth. . . . It is not yet clear to see what the Lord means to do in this time of decision and decision, nor does hopeful patience, prayerful watchfulness seem to be duty and task. But I declare with all certainty, from a conscience bound by ordination promises and life experience, that there can be no question of equal rights for the various directions. Theological directions in honor, but here are religious differences in which not the one opinion, which means bowing the knee before the exalted JEsus and worshipping him as Lord, can be in equal right with the other, which denies both." "But what is most distressing and depressing is the antagonism among the holders of the spiritual office, who, after all, have committed themselves to one confession. It is true that antagonism has always existed in our national church; uniform Lutheranism is no blessing." According to Bezzel, then, doctrinal differences are permitted and are advantageous to the church, so long as only the line separating the positives from the liberals is not crossed. With what word of God Bezzel justifies this position he does not say. As a matter of fact, however, the liberal tendency is also present in Bavaria, as Bezzel himself admits, without the church regiment instituting any proceedings against it. Yes, just as in Prussia Fischer, Traub, and others are virtually challenging the church authorities, so now Geyer and Rittelmeyer, the representatives of liberalism in Bavaria, have announced that they will answer Bezzel's "pastoral letter" in detail. Will Bezzel then intervene and give proof that in Bavaria liberalism has no "equal rights"? - According to the latest news, D. Geyer and D. Rittelmeyer in Nuremberg have already let themselves be heard in the liberal paper "Christentum und Gegenwart," which they have been publishing since the beginning of this year, and which is welcomed with joy and warmly recommended by the "Christliche Welt. And by the entire liberal press Geyer and Rittelmeyer have been supported in their attacks on D. Bezzel, in which they declare that the Bavarian Formula of Obligation places the Bible above the Confession and the Gospel above the Bible. Then they ask: whether such should feel faithless who, to the best of their knowledge and conscience, seek nothing but the purest understanding of the gospel possible to them? In brief words, then, Geher and his comrades declare to the face of the President of the Bavarian High Church that they know themselves to be bound neither by the symbol nor by Scripture, but only by the Gospel, and that such a Gospel appears to be the pure one to people who reject all specifically Christian doctrines: JEsu's deity, virgin birth, atoning death, ascension, sitting at the right hand of God, and future return to judgment. Geyer and Rittelmeyer break off the weapons of Bezel and the Positives at the same time by pointing out the fact that also the Positives in the Bavarian Landeskirche distinguish in the confession between the main and the secondary matter, and by the question attached to it: "Where then is the border, and who is allowed to draw the border?

draw?" Geyer is right: if Scripture and the Confession no longer oblige as such, the door is opened to every arbitrariness and heresy, and it is not convincing when, on the other hand, the "A. E. L. K." remarks: "With this sophistry one can impress laymen, but not a theologian like Bezzel. Every theologian knows that there are fundamental propositions in the Confession, the abrogation of which destroys the Confession itself." This is certainly true. He who denies the deity of Christ directly tears the very heart out of Christianity. But the other also remains true: logically, the denial of any Christian doctrine leads to the denial of all doctrines. And he who no longer fully confesses the Scripture and the symbol, his theology everywhere rests on a foundation of sand. Geyer and Rittelmeyer are especially indignant that Bezzel expects them to have "the willingness to wrestle down misgivings and doubts in dignified defiance." This path to unification, say Geyer and his comrades, seems to them to be a very dangerous path, and for them this "worthy defiance" means as much as arguing against God himself. Here, too, Geyer and Rittelmeyer could have pointed out that the deviations of the positives from Scripture and symbol have their ultimate reason in the fact that they, too, do not want to take their reason captive under the obedience of faith, and that they refuse, in obedience to God's clear Word, to fight down their misgivings and doubts in worthy defiance, and in theology to speak only where God's Word speaks, and to be silent where God's Word is silent, and also to believe where we do not see, understand, see. Summa: The liberals in Bavaria have clearly shown D. Bezzel their teeth. Their public attack amounts to a challenge. And now what? Will the President of the Higher Consistory now intervene and prove by deed that he is serious in his declaration that in Bavaria there can be no question of an equality of tendencies? Or will D. Bezzel, like the presidents in the other regional churches, continue to exercise the supposed "duty of hopeful patience and prayerful watchfulness" in the face of the challenges of the liberals? The liberal "Christian World" is certain of the hope "that D. Bezzel will convince himself of the falsity of his applied standards." How gladly we would report in a subsequent number that this hope of the liberals in Bezzel has been dashed! F. B.

**P. Bodelschwingh** (born on 6 March 1831) died on 2 April. The "N. A. Z." calls him "the great apostle of charity who was given to our time". From 1872 Bodelschwingh devoted himself to the Inner Mission in Bielefeld, where the Institution for Epileptics and the Deaconess Institution were in the process of being established. Since then these institutions have grown into a small state and now number about 1300 sisters in 400 wards, 450 brothers in 140 wards, 2200 epileptics, 500 nervous and mentally ill people, altogether 4500 souls in Bethel, 100 in the Senne branch and 500 in the Moor Colony. It also caused a great stir when Bodelschwingh established a seminary in Bethel some years ago in order to work against liberalism, with which, however, he seems to have had no particular success. Of Bodelschwingh the "Chr. Welt" writes: "There have been times when one could say: he was the most loved and respected man in Germany. Across the boundaries of parties and denominations. Mercy compels."

When Bodelschwingh advocated the old theology, his popularity among the liberals was over. F. B.

**Baptism and the Apostolicum in Baden**. A worker in a rural industrial town registers a daughter for baptism. His wife had suffered much in the weeks before the birth; now he is happy to have her healthy again. It is true that he has had misfortune in the stable during this time: a cow has died on him; he himself is physically miserable from double work and all kinds of excitement. But all this is no hindrance to his being happy and thankful to God. The registration was done; he commends himself. No sooner is he out the door than he returns: "Father, I forgot something else; the child will be baptized in the name of the Triune One, won't it? My wife told me to do it." This is what happened on November 26, 1909, in a village in Baden. Thus do the experiences of the time of the old rationalism repeat themselves. We will experience more. (Ref.)

**From the Rhine Province** the "A. E. L. K." reports: "From Solingen comes the unbelievable news that all positive presbyters have resigned from their office. Since the 'evangelization' of Prof. Weinel in 1902, peace had been taken from the congregation. It is true that in the presbyter elections of 1903 and 1905 the positives once again prevailed, but when in 1907 and 1909 the outspoken enemies of the church, the Social Democrats, were called to the aid of the liberals, a change occurred. The complete rupture, however, was only now to happen. Hitherto the Presbytery counted only three pastors among its liberal members; the remaining twenty-five belonged for the most part to the positive group, for the less to the middle party, which unfortunately, as almost everywhere, has only help and brotherly service ready for the liberals. Now, when ten members retired by rotation, five positives and five middle partisans, the positives proposed the re-election of the same. But the middle partisans agreed with the liberals not to let any more positives in, but five middle partisans and five liberals. The election was the last item on the agenda of the meeting in question. Then suddenly the Liberals moved that this item be taken right now, as some gentlemen could not stay to the close. The Positives protested vigorously because their people were not all there yet. But the Liberals and the Centre Party got their way, whereupon all the Positives left the meeting. Of course, the Liberal list now went through smoothly. After this outrageous surprise, all the Positives submitted a request for their dismissal, which was accepted by the Liberals without complaint. The statement of the positives was as follows: It is with pain and shame that we have experienced the repeated election of representatives by the "Friends of Protestant Freedom" by means of the masses of political Social Democrats, which has covered our congregation with shame before the entire Protestant and Roman Church. We have had to endure the fact that one of those thus elected has doused us in open session with the suds of poisonous derision and mocked our prayer, yes, blasphemed our God whom we serve by comparing us to the Baal's cups of Elijah, without the liberal presiding pastor having duly repudiated such unworthy conduct. Now these gentlemen, at the beginning of the session.

At the meeting of February 6, at which the presbytery was to be re-elected, we managed to overturn the agenda in order to overpower the positive members who were not yet fully present, and to make the election, which was expected at the end, the first business of the meeting. Our protest was voted down, whereupon we left the meeting united. That the gentlemen of the so-called "middle line" (Mittelpartei) also made common cause with our opponents in this election matter by dividing themselves in half in the vacant seats did not surprise us, but brought our decision to full maturity. After all this, therefore, we do not see ourselves in a position to continue to belong to this representation. We refrain from appealing to the authorities, after they have let things go despite repeated complaints or have even turned to the other side. We therefore resign from our offices and leave it to liberalism how it will now govern and build the community. But we are confident that the victory and the future belong to the gospel of Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen Son of God. God's word abideth for ever/ The most depressing thing about this declaration is probably the strong vote of no confidence in the church government, which lets the congregations struggle and seems to care nothing about it." In Solingen, too, the liberals first coveted only toleration, then equality; now they have sole rule and are tyrannizing and raping the positives. And the most "oppressive" thing is that the Positives, by their indifferentism, have been partly responsible for these conditions, and even now, after the liberals have usurped sole rule, they remain quietly in the country church congregation, "leaving it to liberalism" how it will govern and build the congregation. The "E. K. Z." remarks on the rape in Solingen: "We fear that if our national church should once perish, it will die of this constitutional papism." But that the church in Germany itself is perishing, it owes to the indifferentism, the sloth and lukewarmness of those who call themselves Positives and Believers. - According to the latest news, the Positives in Solingen have now addressed a protest to the district synodal board against the conduct of the liberals, in which they emphasize that the liberals have done away with Scripture and confession, no longer stand on the ground of the Reformation, and only speak of "freedom of conscience and courage and strength for personal Christianity" and praise the "mind of Jesus" as the right way to blessedness.

F. B.

**Liberals and Positives in Wuppertal.** Traub and his "friends of evangelical freedom" sought to make propaganda for the full equality of the directions in the regional church here, too, of course, in order to claim sole rights later, as now in Solingen. The result of the discussions, however, was a demonstration in favor of the old faith. In the discussion Traub declared, "Historical research alone could give the 'historical' Jesus anew to mankind. Orthodoxy, he said, had undermined the historicity of Jesus by its faith in Christ, which it placed at the beginning in an unscientific way. The Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels is to be sharply distinguished from the Christ of the early church and of Paul. The idea of Christ was

a confluence of various ideas that were at work in humanity at the time of Jesus. But the bridge from the historical Jesus to Christ and Christianity had not yet been built in a completely satisfactory form." The positives showed that the JEsus picture of the liberals was nothing less than historical. **Lic.** Dick said, "In all centuries Jesus has been rejected as the Saviour of the world by individuals; but it is only in the last 150 years that the scientific underpinning has been begun, which seemed to be completed about ten years ago. Behind the Jesus' of the apostles, painted on a "gold background, rose the noble man Jesus with his God the Father religion. Among its naive adherents this modern religion excited a feeling of satisfaction, for it appeared to be scientifically founded. But modern theology must lose most of its adherents if it is proved that the 'historical' Jesus is unhistorical. That has happened enough in the last ten years. The Jesus of the New Testament Scriptures is quite different. There is no bridge between the modern view and the biblical view. It is not the historical and mythical Jesus that will remain, but Jesus, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners." On the justification of the liberals, Dr. Lorenz, the "friend of liberty," said: "If we are told that we do not belong in the church, we believe it, as long as it is not proved to us that our conception of Christ is wrong. We pay church taxes and can therefore claim to be considered in church representations. We must be allowed liberal pastors or be exempted from taxes. The liberal movement, which, after all, embraces mainly the educated, will continue to grow." That the Positives are not willing to leave the State Church as long as they are tolerated by the liberals, Dr. Bronisch thus expressed, "In the 1900 years of the Christian Church the confession has always held true: Jesus Christ truly God and man! How decisively Luther and Melanchthon confessed this! If the modern trend could once hinder us in our faith in the Church, then we will leave! The church excludes no one; it has in the small nucleus of believers the power to carry even unbelievers and half-believers and to work at their conversion. Liberal theology is on its deathbed. May no one set his life of faith on such deceitful ground!" In Germany one does not want to learn the simple truth that the State, precisely because as such it has nothing to do with religion and the Church, must tolerate all churches and religions, but the Christian Church, precisely because it has to be guided by God's Word, must be "intolerant" of every false doctrine. F. B.

**The battle over the school in France is not yet over**. In mid-February the Archbishop of Paris gathered the Catholics for a diocesan congress, where the question was studied in its various aspects and the battle plan to be followed was discussed. In the Chamber of Deputies the Socialist Allard pronounced the following scathing judgment on the religionless school: "Without God there is no morality, but such a morality is necessary. I maintain that the radicals have made bankruptcy with their school program, which gives youth an incomplete education and turns them into brute savages." At the close of the diocesan convention, Archbishop Amette held a meeting attended by from 10,000 to 15,000 Catholics. Here, among others, the alderman Joseph Ménard delivered a

In this speech he spoke of the "rogues who make the laws and the servants who apply them," and incited the greatest opposition to them. In conclusion, the Archbishop had the following resolution adopted: "Fifteen thousand Catholics, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Paris, loudly testify their indelible attachment to the Church, which is the mother and benefactress of the people; they abhor the acts of violence committed in France against the consciences, and undertake to do all in their power to make the faith of their children, the rights of the families, and full freedom of instruction respected." Among the means to be used, the archbishop mentioned the ballot in the next elections. "The struggle will be hard, and though I do not know the day when victory will come, I know it will come." On the other hand, the government is trying to limit private education. Teachers as well as textbooks are subjected to stricter control. In particular, the school inspector can object **ex officio** or on the charge of the public prosecutor to the opening of a school in the interest of morals, hygiene and the safety of the children, both as regards the person of the applicant and the location of the premises of the future school. The inspectors should also have the right to see the books and exercise books at any time, and the directors of private schools must prove that they have insured their pupils against accidents. France is crushed between the millstones, of Papism and Atheism. For the present, atheism holds the reins. In the recent elections Briand has won again, and the clerics have been beaten all along the line.

**Heretics deserve the death penalty**. This is still the teaching of the Roman Church today. The "Reformation" writes p. 31: "The worst enemies of the Catholic Church are called by the 'Kölnische Volkszeitung' scholars like the professor of dogmatics at the Propaganda in Rome, Father Lépicier, who in his book '**De stabilitate et progressu dogmatis'** holds the view that a heretic may not only be excommunicated, but also justly put to death; for he is, as Aristotle says, worse than a wild animal. As it is no sin to kill a wild beast, so it may be just good to deprive a heretic of the use of a harmful life. Absolutely certain he is (p. 174 f.) that the Church has the right to condemn a heretic to death, and he finds the opposite view dangerous. He says: 'Those Catholic apologists err from the truth who say that the blame for such aphorisms (execution of heretics) is to be ascribed to the secular Inquisition, or who cowardly concede that the Church, following the spirit of the age, has in this matter in some measure transgressed her right.' (p. 183 f.) Elsewhere (p. 190 f.) he holds that heretics and apostates should be forcibly restored to the faith. Against such views the 'Köln. Volkszeitung' raises the strongest possible objection against such views, 'because they are quite capable of having not only a hurtful, but downright inciting effect on non-Catholics. It does not excuse the author at all if, with regard to the tolerance to be observed towards non-believers, he distinguishes between: 1. what the heretics, for their part, deserved by right, and 2. how the Church should behave towards them as mother and as judge, or if he remarks that he would only be able to judge those heretics who were not Catholic.

The first is that he had in mind those who had voluntarily fallen away to heresy and sought to draw others to their deeds by word and example. These deserved, legally speaking, if one considered only their guilt (**attento eorum demerito**), death. However, the church was not in the habit of acting according to strict law. The Church, however, could not itself execute the sentence of death. He does not want the use of force to bring heretics back to the Church to be applied to those who are born in unbelief or in error; for faith must be voluntary (**credere enim voluntatis est**). These theories show that the Servite monk Lépicier is still completely in the 13th century, in the medieval state of faith, and has no idea that today we live in the parity state of law. In the last centuries, the ecclesiastical-political conditions have changed so radically that it must be called downright nonsense to still put forward such theories in all seriousness. Even if the distinction is made between obstinate heretics and the blamelessly erring, who are not to be punished by death, this judgment cannot be mitigated in any way. Writers like Father Lépicier are in our time the worst enemies of the Catholic Church. Besides, it is not reasonable to seriously interpret the Servite Father's remarks as teaching of the Catholic Church; they merely reflect his very personal views, and these theories stand in sharp contrast to all the important recent Catholic canon lawyers.'" Persecution is in the nature of the Papal Church and of every Church which on principle mixes State and Church. Not the "Köln. Volksztg." but Léicier is a consistent Papist. And that the Papal Church no longer persecutes to the same extent as before, and also the "Köln. Volksztg." does not force it to recant, has its reason only in the fact that it lacks the power to do so. F. B.

**King Leopold.** Although the Belgian episcopate is aware of the atrocities in the Congo State and the scandalous marital relations of the late King Leopold, it calls him a great king and speaks of the great services he rendered to Christian civilization! A common pastoral letter says: "The priests have offered the Sacrifice of the Mass, the faithful have prayed and offered Communion for the repose of the soul of the great king whom Belgium has lost, and whose fame, unlike the fate of most human celebrities, will doubtless increase in proportion as the years permit a better appreciation of the splendid services which he rendered to Christian civilization by his genial and persevering energy." With such distortions of the truth, can we be surprised if the people lose all respect for the Catholic Church, and indeed for the Church altogether? (E. K. Z.)

**"To an unknown God", Apost. 17, 23**. D. Deißmann of Berlin brings a short article in the "Chr. W." about the "age of the unknown god". In the same he says: The inscription of the "unknown god" is confirmed and illustrated by literary testimony from Pausanias, Philostratos, and Diogenes of Laerte. "Anonymous" altars were not uncommon in ancient Greece. If one did not know the name of the god who showed himself merciful, one erected an altar

with the inscription: "To the god in question" or: "Unknown gods." According to Pausanias (200 A.D.) and Philostratos (300 A.D.), such altars to "unknown gods" were on the road from Phaleron to Athens. Such an altar, Deitzmann believes, has now been found, but unfortunately with a somewhat mutilated inscription. Dörpfeld reported last year in the Berlin Archaeological Society on the excavations at Pergamon. The most important result was the uncovering of the sacred precinct and temple of Demeter, which was an important sanctuary from about the end of the fourth century B.C. until deep into the imperial period. And the most important find was an altar with an inscription belonging to about the time of Pausanias or Philostratus. The text is mutilated, has three lines, and must be supplemented, according to Hepding and Deitzmann, as follows (we number the lines and put the addition in square brackets): **11. θεοῖς *ἀγν[ώστοις],*** Unknown.

Gods. 2. ***Καπίτ[ων],*** capitone. 3. **δαδοῦχο*[ς],*** the torchbearer. Deitz

mann says: "If the addition is correct, then the inscription would say that, about a hundred years after the foundation of the Christian community in Pergamum, Capitoline, a priest of the Pergamenian Demeter, who had to officiate as torchbearer at her mysteries, donated the altar to 'unknown gods.'" The Athenian altar, whose inscription formed the connecting point for Pauli's speech, probably originated in a similar way. F. B.

**In Germany about 33,000 women and girls are** employed as waitresses. Of these, according to a recently published calculation, only 5 per cent have a working time of 12 hours or less, 13 per cent have to work 12 to 14 hours, 52 per cent 14 to 16 hours, 23 per cent 16 to 18 hours and 114 per cent even over 18 hours a day, and what is more, mostly in closed rooms and in the worst air. According to the law, waitresses have a day off every two or three weeks, but under the conditions described it is to be understood that the same is frequently, if not usually, devoted to vice and dissipation. One of the most sore points in the profession of waitresses is tipping. The pay, however, is usually a very moderate one in regard to' the customary tip. It is not uncommon for tips to amount to 7 marks, or even up to 20 marks a day, out of which, however, the expenses for toilets, broken dishes, and in some cases newspapers, are to be met. The amount of the tip, however, will usually depend on the obligingness of the waitresses, and herein lies the greatest moral danger. That only a few girls resist this danger is shown, among other things, by the fact that even in Munich, where there are hardly any real bars of entertainment, these hotbeds of vice, 80 per cent of the diseases among waitresses are due to venereal diseases, and that in Baden almost half of the persons brought before the courts and punished for commercial fornication are waitresses. In Germany 130,000 women have now signed a petition to the Reichstag for the abolition of the waitress requirement. The fact is that many pubs could close immediately if they no longer had the draw of female waitresses.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56.** **June 1910.** **No. 6.**

## The satisfactio vicaria according to Isaiah 53.

(Conclusion.)

The last, fourth part of the Jeshian sermon, 53:10-12, reads: "And it pleased the LORD to bruise him, afflicted him with sickness: if he would offer for a trespass offering his soul, he should see a seed, and live to the length, and the LORD's purpose should pass away by his hand. Because of the travail of his soul he shall see, he shall be satisfied; by his knowledge he shall render righteousness, the righteous, my servant, unto many; and their iniquities shall he take upon him. Therefore I will give him a portion with the many, and with the strong he shall divide the spoil, because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the wicked; and he bare many sins, and stood for the wicked."

In this last passage of his passion sermon the prophet obviously speaks of the exaltation of the servant of the Lord, to which he already referred in the previous passage, and of the work of the exalted one. But he also here bases the exaltation of the Messiah on the preceding humiliation. The suffering and death of Christ, its purpose and effect, is also in these closing words the real **nervus rei**.

The whole of the foregoing was based on the thought that what the servant of the Lord wrought and suffered here on earth was of the Lord, the Lord sent this His servant, the Lord cast upon Him the iniquity of us all. Now v. 10 is emphasized **expressis verbis**: XXXX XXXX XXXX. This is to say, It pleased the LORD so, this was the LORD's counsel to crush him, the LORD, according to his counsel and good pleasure, hath inflicted upon him sickness, the great woe which is before described. And now in the following words the thoughts of the LORD are further expressed: XXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XX etc. "If a-

would set a trespass offering his soul, he should see a seed," etc. In the antecedent clause is subject and predicate. The soul of the servant of God sets a trespass offering, but of course it is itself the trespass offering. The servant of the LORD institutes himself, ss ix>86 and 86 ip8um, as a trespass-offering.

The passion of Christ is again seen from a new side, namely as a sacrifice. The lamb that is led to the slaughter, v. 7, now appears as a sacrificial lamb. The idea of sacrifice in general is here the more general term. The prophet interprets the silent language of Israel's sacrifices. When an Israelite had transgressed any of God's commandments, he took, according to the precept of the law, an animal of his flock, in which there was no blemish or infirmity, and brought it to the tabernacle, and later to the temple, and that into the court of the sanctuary. There he laid his hand upon the head of the beast, substituting the same for his person, and so symbolically transferred to it his sin, his guilt. That the laying on of hands meant this, that not only in general the animal was consecrated to the Lord, is evident from Leb. 16, 21, where it is commanded that the high priest should lay both his hands on the head of the one sin offering and "confess upon him all the iniquities of the children of Israel . . . and lay them upon the head of the goat." Then the Israelite slaughtered the sacrificial animal. Man had forfeited his life with his sin, deserved death. Now, in "fine stead, the innocent life of the beast was given unto death, the blood of the beast was shed. The beast, imputed with man's sin, atoned for the sinner's punishment. Only now did the officiating priest intervene in the sacrificial act. He took the blood of the animal and spread it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering, or waved it on the side of the altar, or poured it out on the base of the altar, and thus brought it near to God. For the altar was the place where God would meet with his people. Ex. 29, 42. The blood of the sacrificial animal came between sinful man and the holy God and thus atoned for man's sin. Throughout the law the blood of sacrifices is ascribed the power and effect of atoning for sin. The Hebrew term for atonement is 122 This word, properly "cover," is found only in a figurative sense of covering "the sin, the guilt. The sacrificial blood applied to the altar covered the sin or covered the sinful man before God, before God's eyes, so that God now no longer saw his sin, no longer looked at it, no longer imputed it to him. For this very reason the blood served as atonement for sin, because in and with the blood the life, the soul of the beast was shed and thus the punishment of sin was atoned for. Lev. 17, 11. That finally the flesh of the sacrificial animal or a part of it was set on fire on the altar and burned, "to God for a sweet savour", symbolized and testified that God

was now no longer angry with sinful man, but looked upon him with eyes of favor. This sacrificial cult was the center of Israelite worship. From the days of Moses, the eyes of the children of Israel were fixed upon the sacrifice and the blood of the sacrifices. The Israelites, who had distanced themselves from God with their transgressions and now wanted to get right with God again, to put their consciences at rest, offered the soul, the life of the innocent animals in their place to God. That the blood of lambs, goats, and oxen could not in itself cleanse their consciences of sin, they themselves felt well enough. But the sacrifice of the animals was related from the beginning to the promise that God had made to sinful men immediately after the fall. After God the Lord had promised the first sinners the seed of the woman, which was to bruise the head of the serpent, He Himself made them garments of animal skins to cover their nakedness, and thus indicated that the death, the blood of the animals should serve for the time being, until the promised Redeemer would come, as a covering, as an expiation of their guilt and shame. That was the institution of the bloody sacrifice. And when later the children of Israel offered the sacrifices prescribed by the law of Moses to God in order to make atonement for Him, they involuntarily thought of the promise which had passed especially to the seed of Abraham and which had been preserved in their consciousness by the Torah of Moses, the teaching of the priests, the preaching of the prophets, of the promise of the coming Redeemer who should finally atone for and take away sin, guilt, punishment. And now Isaiah, the evangelist of the Old Covenant, interprets **expressis verbis the prophecy which** lay in the sacrifice of the beasts, and which gave to that sacrifice its atoning power and effect, and points in advance, as with uplifted hand, to the sacrifice of the New Testament, to the Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world. Yes, Christ is the right sacrifice. "The self-sacrifice of the Servant of Yahweh," as Delitzsch remarks, "is the total antitype, the truth, the goal, and the finality of all sacrifices." The Old Testament sacrifice was the shadow; Christ is the body itself. Christ is sacrifice and priest in one person. In the Old Covenant the Israelite who had sinned substituted a sacrificial animal for his person. This, of course, was an outward thing and work. Of Christ it is said that his soul instituted a sacrifice, instituted himself as a sacrifice. That Christ has appointed himself, **se ipsum,** his own soul, his life, his God-human life in our stead with God, and that he himself, **se ipse, has** offered his life, voluntarily, self-willedly, out of love to sinners, in obedience to God's counsel and will to God, this is the incomparable, infinite value of Christ's sacrifice. God Himself caused all our iniquity to fall upon His servant, and Christ appropriated to Himself our evil part, our sin. This is not allegorical, but-

The actual, real **imputation** and transfer, assumption of guilt, **imputatio culpae vera and realissima**. Christ was slain on the trunk of the cross. He died the death of sinners. He Himself laid down His life, shed His blood. And God, has inflicted upon Him sickness, woe, death, God Himself has taken upon His servant the execution of punishment. Thus the punishment, all the punishment of sin, is truly atoned for, paid off. With his own blood, with his holy, precious blood of God, Christ appeared before God himself, Heb. 9:12, 24, he is our mediator in the highest throne, he asserted his blood before God, and thus, not only temporarily, but once for all, atoned for our sins, the guilt of the whole world, and reconciled God, turned God's wrath against sinners into vain pleasure.

We see that in the sacrifice, in the sacrifice of Israel symbolically and exemplarily, in the sacrifice of Christ **vere et realiter,** all the moments of vicarious satisfaction are concentrated. And this is especially true of the kind of sacrifice mentioned by the prophet, the trespass-offering. means, as Delitzsch rightly explains, the trespass, then the trespass-atonement, and thence the sacrifice which makes the trespass even and free. If an Israelite had committed an embezzlement, had withheld something from the offerings, sacrifices, tithes, first fruits to be consecrated to God, or from what had been commanded, if he had violated the rights of his neighbor, had unlawfully appropriated something from his neighbor's property, had neglected property entrusted to him, or had appropriated something lost, he had to repay the stolen sum and, above all, offer a guilt offering to God, the value of which was determined by the priest. Lev. 5, 14 ff. "From all these cases it undoubtedly appears that the idea underlying the trespass-offering is that of satisfaction for rights violated and to be restored or recovered." Keil. Christ is the antitype precisely also of the guilt-offering. Our sins are misappropriations, violations of rights. We have deprived God of the service and obedience due, the neighbor of the love due, have violated the right of the neighbor, and above all the divine right, which indeed comprehends in itself the right of the neighbor, have committed, as it were, robbery of the sanctuary, a sacrilege. We have contracted a debt to God, the repayment of which is demanded by God's justice, but which we can never repay. We have done harm with our sins, which we can never make good. But then the faithful servant of the Lord interceded for us and, not compelled by any commandment of God, of his own free will, out of undeserved love, offered his own soul, his own life, as payment, as compensation for damages, as atonement, as guilt offering, and thus did enough for the divine right, the divine justice. Delitzsch: "In how far it - namely, the self-sacrifice of the servant of Yahweh - is the antitype of the guilt- or

penitential sacrifice is, the emphasis of the counter-image lies in the equivalent paid for the sacrileges of our sins of divine justice. The notion of the indemnifying payment ... is peculiar to the asham, and at the same time a concept comes to specific expression in it which Hofmann denies to sacrifice, namely, the concept of the **satisfactio** required by divine justice and of the **poena** offsetting the contracted guilt, but here, where the soul of God's servant, the individual, One who represents Israel, procures such a penitential sacrifice by offering himself up as such with his life highly valued by God: the concept of the **satisfactio vicaria.**" Yes, this is indisputable scriptural truth. He who denies the character of **satisfactio vicaria**, of substitution, of payment of debt, of equivalent, to the passion and death of Christ, commits a saerilsMum, he offends against the sunniest sayings of divine revelation, he devalues and empties the gospel of Christ, he robs the heavily burdened consciences, which labor oppressed by their guilt, of the only consolation that can raise them up again, the only possibility of becoming even and free from their unbearable burden.

And now if the servant of God would use or have used his soul as a guilt offering, the prophet speaks from the thoughts of God, "he should see a seed and live long"-actually, live long days, "and the Lord's purpose should go away by the Lord's hand." These three members of the postscript 10b are closely related. The servant of the LORD was to come to life again out of death, to a new and incorruptible life, and also the exalted Messiah was still to carry out the LORD's work and counsel, and this is the purpose which God intends to set in motion through him, that he should gain a seed, a "numerous posterity. This is the main term seed here. The present statement is connected with earlier prophecies. In the 22nd Psalm, which also deals with the humiliation and exaltation of Christ, in the second half, from v. 23, it is prophesied that the exalted Messiah would preach the name of the Lord to his brethren, and proclaim to his brethren on earth that the Lord had heard his cry, and had delivered him out of his grievous affliction; that even the distant heathen would hear this, and turn to the Lord; that all succeeding generations also would hear of what God had done for him, and through him; and that he would thus always have a seed to serve him. The preaching of the gospel is the work of the exalted Christ, and the gathering of the New Testament church from all the nations of the earth is the fruit and effect of this preaching. According to Ps. 72, 17 the name of the King Christ shall endure forever and his name, his word shall sprout; these sprouts are the Gentiles who bless themselves in his name and

blessed. According to Ps. 110, 3 children will be born to the New Testament Melchizedek, the priest-king Christ, a youthful crew, like the dew from the dawn. And so the prophet Isaiah 8, 18 says of the children whom the Lord Jehovah gave to Christ Immanuel, and whom Christ will one day present to God as preserved and saved children. And 11, 1 he prophesies that the little rice that sprouts from the root-stump of Jesse will eventually bear fruit. The same thoughts are now expressed in our prophecy. The present **status quo** is here described, which began with the exaltation of Christ and will continue until the end of days. The nations of the Gentiles and their kings hear a completely new, wonderful news, the news of the Servant of the Lord, who was so lowly humbled and then so highly exalted. 52, 13-15. The messengers of God go through the countries, proclaiming peace, preaching good, proclaiming salvation, the salvation that Christ has purchased for men on earth. 52:7 But in this preaching the power, the arm of the exalted Christ is at work. It is Christ Himself who, through His organs on earth, preaches the great acceptable year of the Lord. 61:3, And so this word cannot remain without fruit. By word and spirit Christ wins, gathers to himself a seed, a holy seed, a seed that serves him, a people of property, that proclaims his fame, and is diligent to good works, he begets to himself children that have his kind, and in whom he sees his pleasure. The seed of which Isaiah says is, as Luther renders it XXX, the **ecclesia**. The church of Christ has its existence, its life, and that is imperishable, divine life, from the exalted Christ, who lives to the length, from the living Christ, who with his breath of life called it into existence. But since the word which brings about the new birth, in which the spirit and breath of the Lord blow, is also the preaching of Christ, of Christ's salvific suffering and death, the church, on the other hand, is also the fruit of Christ's passion. That the exalted Christ now has and sees a seed is not only the temporal consequence but also the effect of his sacrificial death. That he has laid down his own life for sinners, surely this cannot leave sinners cold when they hear it; it draws them to him, that they yield themselves body and soul to him who gave himself for them. Who should not be heartily grateful to the faithful servant of God, the friend from heaven who has paid our heavy debt and restored us to God, and not do everything for his sake?

The following sentence says essentially the same as v. 10, only that the effect of the passion of Christ is put under a different aspect. It is v. 11a: XXXX XXXX XXXX. "By reason of
the travail of his soul he shall see, he shall be satisfied." The expression XXXX XXX again points back to the suffering and death of Christ. XXX

unites in itself the concepts of work and toil. Christ's suffering was laborious work. And his soul labored. Christ labored with all the powers of body and soul, and also used his divine power to accomplish his task, his severe suffering. His suffering truly had not only "material" value, but was also a personal achievement. What was laid upon him, sin and all its consequences, was foreign, nay repugnant, to his fine pure holy soul, to his divine nature. But he took this odious burden upon himself, bore it quietly and patiently, and bore it until it was borne away. He worked down sin, guilt, punishment, as it were, overcoming through and in Himself. And the seed, the church was now the reward, the purchase of his labour, in which he now sees his air and is satisfied. After God made heaven and earth in six days, he looked with pleasure on all his works. Christ having accomplished his sour work of suffering, his work of redemption, and having entered into his glory, now looks with satisfaction upon the fruit of his labour. As a laborer, having succeeded in his work, refreshes and delights in the result, in the reward of his labor, so the exalted Lord delights in his church, which he has purchased by his own blood. Act. 20:28 He rejoices in a royal way when he sees new crowds of poor sinners coming to him in the course of time, who first gave him trouble and labor with their sins and now become his own and serve him and thank him for his sour labor. Christ has borne the sins of the whole world, and with his bloody merit has won God's grace and pleasure for all mankind. Unfortunately, most people do not want to acknowledge or accept the merit of Christ, and thus forfeit God's grace. It is the congregation that actually benefits from Christ's good deeds, that participates in them, and to which the grace remains. And so the church is the lasting fruit of Christ's suffering, the joy and delight of his eyes.

The prophet continues v. 11b: XXXX XXX XXXX XXXX. "By his knowledge he will render justice, the righteous, my servant, to the many." The XXXX is the main term here. The Hiphil XXXX is, as is generally acknowledged, the solenne term for "to speak righteously" or "to regard righteously," **justum pronunciare or reputare**, is used only in this forensic sense. The servant of the LORD, the absolutely righteous, also makes righteous, makes sinners righteous, so that they stand as righteous before God. He is at once **ὁ *δίκαιος* and ὁ *δίκαιων*.** Cf. Rom. 3, 26. This δικαιοῦν ge
belongs to the purpose of the LORD, which the LORD carries out by the hand of the exalted Messiah. But the XXXX in our place has with it not an accusative object, but a dative object. It is called XXXX XXXX. This wants to say: The exalted Christ helps the many.

to justice, creates justice for them. Not to many, but "to the many." This is a definite number, **certus numerus**. According to the context, all those persons are meant who constitute the seed, the church. By His sacrificial death, by His bloody atonement, Christ established the righteousness that is before God. When sin is atoned for, blotted out, there is righteousness. And this righteousness the exalted Christ now turns to the many, helps them to a state of righteousness. The means which he uses for this is given as XXXXX. This is translated by most older exegetes as **per cognitionem sui**, by most newer interpreters as **per cognitionem suam.** Both translations are linguistically admissible. According to the former version, it is meant that Christ makes the many righteous by their knowing him, and this is identical with faith. But if this were the Prophet's opinion, he would surely have expressed himself in such a way that the many are justified by the knowledge of Christ, or by faith in Christ. By employing Christum as the subject, one- first comes to the thought that Christ helps the many to righteousness through the XXX ascribed to him. By this version, **per cognitionem suam,** is then to be understood of Christ's wisdom. In this way, in that the exalted Christ presents, communicates, his wisdom to the many, he turns righteousness to them. Prov. 2:6 we read, "The LORD giveth wisdom (XXXX), out of his mouth cometh knowledge (XXX) and understanding." XXXX and XXX are synonyms. Luk. 7, 35 speaks of wisdom, σοφία, which spoke first through John, then through Christ. Thus in our place it is said that Christ has and gives wisdom, that out of his, mouth comes wisdom. The contents of this heavenly wisdom, this heavenly, divine doctrine, are, according to the context, the same as in the tidings which many Gentiles and their kings are given to hear, 52:15, namely, the deep, severe suffering of the Servant of the Lord, and the atonement which he procured thereby, as well as the righteousness before God which is thereby set and given. The words of the prophet say nothing else than what the apostle testifies when he writes that through the gospel the righteousness that is before God is revealed. Christ, in His Word, offers wisdom, teaches, instructs the many, teaches them inwardly, so that they may grasp this wisdom, receive it into themselves. Thus also in this version the subjective moment, that the many recognize Christ and his redemption, believe in Christ, is not excluded but included. In sum, through the word and the faith that the word works, Christ applies to the many the righteousness that he has purchased. And the congregation of believers now stand before their Lord in heaven, the righteous, in the ornament of righteousness, perfect innocence and righteousness. And so it is the feast for the eyes of Christ, who sees his own righteousness in it.

Image. This is the connection of v. 11b and 11a. From the righteousness of faith follows the righteousness of life. The seed that belongs to Christ is a holy seed. Admittedly, according to their life and walk, in their heart believers are not so pure and spotless. The new spiritual life, which also comes from Christ, is still very weak and imperfect. The righteous still stumble manifoldly. But if our daily sins offend us, we have the consolation, XXXX XXX XXXXX. That is, "and their iniquities will he is to bear upon himself". Older and more recent commentators take this statement to be identical with vv. 4-6, and refer it to the atonement of guilt which Christ made by suffering and dying. But the futures in these verses name what is future, not from the standpoint of the prophet, but from the standpoint of the humiliation of the Servant of God. What Christ did here on earth, suffered, is described in this chapter, even v. 12 still, in perfects. Thus we judge with Delitzsch: "By this XXXX, which, standing in the same line with the preceding imperfects in a futural sense, signifies a work of occupation beyond that accomplished on this side, is meant the continued efficacy of His XXXX v. 4 is meant: his perpetual charging of our debts is but the constant presence and representation of his atonement once for ever made; the dead but living one is, on account of his one-sacrifice of himself, eternal priest, who now administers the goods he has acquired." Christ once for ever, as he suffered and died, bore, bore off, made atonement for our iniquities, but this atonement has perpetual force, effect, and validity. Our Christ has and retains the name and title and glory of being our sin-bearer. He continually makes his bloody merit to God. And so our continual weakness and sinfulness cannot shake the standing of righteousness, cannot deprive us of our good name and standing with God.

In the final sentence of our prophecy, v. 12, the Lord Himself takes the floor and makes a promise to His servant, the exalted Messiah. The whole time of grace in the New Testament shows the fulfillment of this promise. God spoke and speaks of Christ, and performs this: "Therefore will I give him a portion with the many, and with the strong shall he divide spoil." The Hebrew text suffers no other translation or interpretation. God gives Christ a portion in the many, makes them a gift to him, gives them to him as his own, that they are now his portion and inheritance. "The many," XXXX, as noted, are all **membra ecclesiae**. The church is not an indefinite, fluid quantity, though the same be known to God alone, but is a closed number, a **certus numerus,** and that the **numerus or coetus electorum**. In the last chapters of his prophecy, Isaiah refers to all the servants of the Lord who will finally attain eternal life.

long, repeated as the chosen ones of God. The children mentioned in 8:18 were given to Christ by God from the beginning, from eternity. And these elect souls God then leads to Christ in time, that they become **de facto** his own; the Father draws them to the Son. In the foregoing it was said of these same persons that they form the seed, the posterity of Christ; the exalted Christ has given them new birth by Word and Spirit. On the other hand, it is God the Father who brings them to Christ, converts them to Christ, turns their hearts, their wills to Christ. Conversion is both God's and Christ's work and effect. Paul testifies in Eph. 2 that while we were yet dead in sins, God made us alive with Christ, and through JESUS Christ the exalted Mediator. And even with the strong Christ shall divide spoil. The term "spoil" points back to a preceding kamps. Christ's suffering was sour work and hot battle. Christ wrestled there with hostile powers, with powers of destruction, sin, guilt, punishment, death, hell, and conquered them by atonement and forbearance. And the spoils of his struggle and victory are forgiveness of all sins, righteousness, life, blessedness. Of this also "strong ones," XXXXXX, get their part. Even strong ones, strong spirits, strong, distinguished, great, gross sinners, who have set themselves against God and His Christ with special energy and perseverance, are still finally overcome by God's power and grace, that they fall at Christ's feet, enter into Christ's kingdom, and taste and enjoy the goods of the kingdom of heaven, the goods of salvation. We think, for example, only of Paul, who was first a furious enemy of God and persecutor of Christ, but whom God then made a servant and apostle of JEsu Christ. Now this promise which God gave to Christ, and the performance of it, is, like all that was said before of the **status gloriae of** Christ, built upon the humiliation, the salvific suffering and death of Christ as its foundation. The sentence v. 12 begins with which points back to Christ's self-sacrifice and suffering previously mentioned, and this XXX is taken up again with the XXX XXX v. 12b. This is the opinion: therefore, in substitution and recompense for Christ's having given His life unto death, God giveth Him the many, even strong ones, The second half of the verse comprises four members. The first member reads, "for that he hath poured out his soul unto death." The verbum XXXX means, as Delitzsch rightly explains: to make bare, empty, pour out pure, to shed to the last. Christ poured out His life, His life-blood, into death, poured out His heart-blood to the last drop, poured out Himself completely. This expression again so rightly illustrates the matchless love, sinner love of Christ. He has, as the second member says, "imputed Himself to the workers of iniquity." He is the death of the workers of iniquity, evils-

The Lord died to the wicked, humbled Himself to an ignominious death on the cross. And in the third and fourth members the purpose and meaning of Christ's self-sacrifice is again emphasized. "And He bare the sin of many." It is said here of many, not of the many. Christ bore the sin of many, of all men, which, alas, not all men, but the members of the church take to heart, and make use of. The composition of the personal designations, XXXX and XXXX also marks the substitution here. And the idea of substitution receives its proper, adequate expression in the closing word of the Jeshian sermon, "and for the workers of iniquity he stood in." The XXXX a preterite normalized by the preceding preterites, is, strictly speaking, **intercessit**. This his bitter suffering of death, his willing self-sacrifice, is thus repaid to Christ by God's bringing to him, after he has exalted and glorified him, many sinners who now form his people, his church. But this is no accidental substitute. The gathering of the church, as we already noted at 10b, is not only the temporal but the internal consequence, the effect of His self-sacrifice. The fact that Christ poured out his life and soul to save sinful people from death and destruction and to keep them alive, this unique love has already done it to many sinners when they heard about it, has softened many hard hearts, and has also broken the defiance and resistance of many a strong, great sinner. God has already converted many apostate children to Christ, their Redeemer, by pressing into their hearts and consciences the word of Christ's death, blood, and wounds, of his self-sacrifice. Yes, and even if the prophet is right in his complaint that so comparatively few believe his preaching, Christ has truly not suffered and labored in vain, it is still a great multitude of poor sinners who in the course of time are won by the word of the cross and gathered around the banner of the crucified and risen Christ.

We have come to the end of our interpretation of the JESAIC sermon. We conclude by recalling some of the concluding remarks of earlier commentators. Luther remarks: **Subinde re- petit Christi passionem propheta, ut fere totum caput nihil aliud fuit quam repetitiones, sed tamen ut semper aliquid addat. . . . Ita etiam sint repetitiones merae, tamen semper aliquid accedit. . . . Est enim propheta Esaias hoc in loco valde eloquens, qui potest eandem rem aliis atque aliis verbis et modis eloqui. Hi sunt veri rhetores, qui eandem rem dicere norunt aliis atque aliis verbis subinde et modis, ac semper tamen aliquid addere significantius**. Certainly, these are the right orators and preachers, who, like Isaiah here, have one and the same thing, and just the one great main thing, the **satisfactio vicaria, which** Christ performed, and on which the entire

We always repeat God's counsel of love concerning our blessedness, from which the work of God's grace, our redemption, justification, conversion, is based, but always present it to us in a new way with different words, always adding something new to the old, which is even more significant than what was said before. Brenz writes:

**Spiritus S. non delectatur inani βαττολογία, et tamen quum in hoc capite videatur βαττολόγος *καί ναυτολόγος είναι,* dubium non est, quin tractet rem cognitu maxime necessariam**. There is a justifiable tautology, just such as Luther has marked in the above, and it is in place where it is a matter of which the right knowledge is so important and necessary; and nothing is more important and necessary than to know Christ rightly, who was given up for our sins, and raised again for our justification. For he is our only comfort in life and in death. Bredenkamp, in his concluding reflection on Isaiah 63, expatiates on the significance of the idea of substitution, reminding us, "No less than twelve times, to which desires call attention, the thought returns that the servant of Yahweh bears the guilt." This, it seems, all Christians have learned from their youth, that Christ is the Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world. But nothing so easily and quickly escapes the frightened and despondent hearts in which the consciousness of guilt has come alive, as this truth. Thus a Christian preacher can render no greater service to his hearers than that he should hold them by every possible means to this centre of Christian truth, to Christ our Substitute and Sin-bearer. Let this be the keynote, the conclusion, and the amen of all Christian preaching, what Isaias expounds in his great sermon, and wherewith he concludes it: **pro peccatoribus intercessit**, the **satisfactio vicaria.** G. St.

---

# Pelagius.

Nothing is known about the earlier life of the heresiarch Pelagius except that he came from Britain and belonged to a monastic order there. That he was born on the same day as his great opponent Augustine is undoubtedly a legend. He has been a well-known personality since his stay in Rome. It is not possible to determine exactly when he came to Rome, but at any rate for a long time before the year 410. Because he was familiar with the Greek language and theology, it has been assumed that he had been in the Orient before his stay in Rome. But there is no definite evidence for this. He may have become acquainted with Oriental theology while still in his monastery in England. He may also have acquired knowledge of it during his stay in Rome.

have. There he remained until the year 411, when he went to Africa with his friend Celestius. It is also possible that he fled Rome in 410 during the invasion of the Visigoths and traveled to Africa via Sicily.

In Rome, Pelagius took offense at the laxity and slackness of the Christian life there. Many wanted to partake of the goods of grace without taking their Christian conversion seriously. They sought to excuse themselves, and said:[1] **) durum est, arduum est, non possumus, homines sumus fragili carne circumdati**. Yes, as a remnant of Manichaean doctrine, the proposition was even put forward that man should have been so created by God that he could not sin at all, whereby the guilt of sin was attributed to God. Pelagius was right, of course, to urge serious Christian change in the face of such speeches and excuses. He must have correctly described the nature of some when he said that it is very easy, with downcast eyes and face, to promise humility and meekness, to speak softly, to sigh, and to exclaim at every word that one is a poor sinner; but the same one who behaves in this way is offended by the slightest word, and is provoked to proud countenances and senseless cries. But instead of opposing such hypocrisy with the word of God, in which alone lies the power to renew the heart, Pelagius wanted to help with his wisdom. If those people said in excuse of their sinful walk, "Christian living is hard, we cannot," he said in opposition, "No, you can, you are capable of good by your own power." Thus he denied the fact of original sin; but he did not say so at first, but he did impute to man the capacity for good, that is, freedom of the will even in spiritual things. The power to do good, he said, God had placed in man, and the consciousness of this power and ability must be awakened in man, so that he may strive vigorously forward and not be hindered by the thought that he is unable to accomplish anything. He elaborated on this teaching in a letter to a noble Roman woman, Demetrias, who had entered a convent; she was to be encouraged by him to lead a holy life. "God gave," writes Pelagius, "man the free choice between good and evil, and in this freedom (**in hac utriusque partis libertate**) consists the adornment of the rational soul. - That we can do evil is an advantage of our nature; for thereby the good becomes all the more meritorious. - By this freedom of will the philosophers were already chaste, patient, modest, liberal, and had all the virtues. But the Christian can and ought to have them much sooner, since he has been instructed by Christ for his life and (about?) his nature." (p. 41 f.)

1) The quotations are taken from: Klasen, "The Inner Development of Pelagianism".

But about what Christ actually taught, about how a poor sinner is saved, how fallen man is renewed, Pelagius asks nothing or knows nothing about it. Rather, he says further, "You must measure the goodness of nature first of all according to its Creator, that is, according to God. Since he determined to create man in his own image or likeness, he showed, before he created man, how he intended to create him. He endued him with reason and prudence, and with reason man is to serve God, and not to the compelled, but to the voluntary executor of his commands, has God made man." (P. 121.) Of the glorious liberty, then, of the true children of God, Pelagius has no idea.

The letter goes on to say: "Nature was so well created by God that it needed no help at all; it did not even need the external law in order to recognize and choose the good. If God wanted man to be righteous, he certainly had to equip his nature sufficiently for this purpose." (According to Pelagius, the Fall had no direct effect at all.) "But when man's knowledge had become dark and sooty through long habit of sin, God gave the Mosaic law so that man might orient himself to this limit and strive to return to former splendor. For what hinders us most from doing good is the habit of sin. God came to our aid against this first through the law, and last of all through Jesus Christ, our Savior. He instructed us by his grace; by him we are born again to better men, are reconciled and cleansed by his blood, are incited by his example to perfect living." (S. 43.)

Grace, then, according to Pelagius, proves itself primarily through instruction, through the manifestation of the divine will, and Christ is essentially the model. But if nature is so good, as described above, that it does not even need the law in order to remain on the right path, then regeneration is nothing but a figure of speech, and it is impossible to see why reconciliation through Christ's blood should be necessary.

From what has been said it is clear enough that Pelagius and his followers did not allow themselves to be determined by Scripture. They accepted what suited them, and for the rest only what they could rhyme with their reason - **quod ratione defendi potest**. In the interpretation of Scripture they proceeded with the greatest arbitrariness. If Augustin held against them Rom. 3, 23: "**omnes pecca- verunt,**" they said that the Jews and Gentiles were meant, but not the Christians. When their attention was called to Rom. 5:12, "because they have all sinned," they said, "all" must be taken here, as often in Scripture-"many." When the apostles prayed: "Forgive us our trespasses", they did not pray for themselves, but for the whole church. Gal. 5, 17: "The flesh lusteth against

the Spirit," does not apply to the baptized; for the apostle says of them Rom. 8, 9, that they are not carnal. But ch. 7, 14 he says, "I am carnal," etc. The passage Rom. 9, 16: "Therefore it is not up to anyone to will or to run, but up to God's mercy" must be understood as a reproving question, with which the apostle rebukes those who say that man cannot will and do good. Phil. 2, 13: "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do" must be understood, as Augustine reports, according to Pelagius, of the greatness of the future glory and the promised reward, by which God entices man's willing and doing. (S. 92.)

How little Scripture means in the Pelagian system may be shown by another example, namely, the proof that man can be without sin. This. This proof does not come from Pelagius himself, but from his friend Cölestius; but it may stand here, because it is characteristic of the whole direction. The proof is this: "First of all, he who denies that man can be without sin must be asked what any sin is, whether it is something that can be avoided, or something that cannot be avoided. If it is something that cannot be avoided, it is not sin; if it is something that can be avoided, man can be without sin, because it can be avoided; for no reason and justice suffer anything to be called sin which cannot be avoided at all." (P. 53.) From this it is clear that in Pelagianism there is not the least understanding of the nature of sin, nor the least respect for the word of Scripture.

"Sin," however, was to be avoided; Christians were to lead a moral life. Pelagius insisted on this with zeal. His demands were partly of a monkish nature. He taught, for example, that one should not swear absolutely, and that a rich man should not enter the kingdom of heaven if he remained in his wealth and did not sell all that was his. It would be of no use to him, for example, to observe the commandments while he is rich, etc. As this last, so with Pelagius everything is external legalism. What God has done and is doing for the salvation of mankind, reconciliation and regeneration, is not for him the source of morality and of a Christian change, but only a means, coming from without, for the stimulation of moral energy; and if the religious motive once comes into play, it is, according to the legal standpoint, the fear of God.

In this sense Pelagius worked in Rome, even if not everything communicated here immediately so clearly Herbortrat as in the course of the following doctrinal dispute. Already his first statements are clear enough, so that one could be surprised that not already during his Auf-.

in Rome, opposition arose against him. But this stay in Rome was at a time when the floods of the migration of the peoples were pouring over Italy, and just at the last time the capital was trembling before the coming of the Visigoth Alaric and had to bow to him. Moreover, the Romans of that time were a rather degenerate race, and if anyone was zealous for serious Christian change, it could easily be overlooked that the zeal rested on false ground. Pelagius was also praised from many sides because of his fine zeal.

In the year 411 Pelagius went to Africa, where it was very important to him to win the highly respected Augustin for his cause. But he did not meet him in Hippo, his episcopal see. At Carthage, where Augustin was then staying because of the Donatist disputes, he did meet with him, but without any detailed discussion. Augustin says he saw fine face there, as far as he could remember, only once or twice. (P. 16.) Pelagius did not remain long there either, but journeyed to Palestine. From there he wrote a letter to Augustin, in which, as can be seen from Augustin's reply, he said many beautiful things about him. In his reply Augustine calls him **frater dilectissimus et desideratissimus and** says that he should pray for him, that he may become what he already considers him to be.

But Cölestius, who had come to Africa with Pelagius, remained in Carthage and applied there for the office of presbyter. Then the deacon Paulinus of Milan stood up against him and sued him for fine doctrine at a synod held in Carthage in the year 412. The six charges presented related primarily to the denial of original sin. He was also charged with teaching that Adam was mortal even if he had not sinned. The children would be born in the same state in which Adam was before the fall. Adam's sin had harmed only him, not his descendants. Both before and after the coming of the Lord there were people who did not sin. The work of the Redeemer did not bring so profound a contrast with former times, but the law brings to heaven as well as the gospel. (**Lex sic mittit ad regnum coelorum quomodo et evangelium**.) As Adam's sin could not be regarded as the cause of the reign of death, so Christ's resurrection must not be regarded as the sole cause of our resurrection.

In the negotiations, Cölestius tried to avoid the main question of original sin by saying that it was a theological problem and not a question of faith. He conceded the necessity of infant baptism, but said it was only necessary because it was the necessary condition, confirmed by the Lord, for participation in the kingdom of God, and so on. Whoever answers these evasive questions

did not satisfy the Synod, and because Cölestius would not recognize the above propositions as false and reject them, he was excommunicated. He then went to Ephesus.

From this first act of the Pelagian doctrinal dispute Augustin wrote the three books **De peccatorum meritis et remissione ac de baptismo parvulorum**. The further scene of the dispute, however, became at first the Orient.

Pelagius had gone from Africa to Jerusalem and was received there by the bishop John. But he came into conflict with Jerome, who took offence at his teaching and, because he was in contact with Augustine, would probably also have been informed about the events in Carthage. What Jerome, in his Dialogues **adversus Pelagium, chiefly** reproved was that Pelagius claimed of man, the creature so far removed from the Creator, that he could be without sin. With Jerome, the Spanish presbyter Orosius also came out against him. To settle the dispute, the bishop of Jerusalem held a meeting of his presbyters in 415. When Orosius was called upon to give an account of the events in Africa, he first read a letter of Augustine to a bishop in Sicily, where the Pelagian doctrine had previously caused great disturbance. He then laid great stress on the fact that this doctrine had already been rejected by men like the great Augustine and Jerome, indeed - he must not have been a great theologian - he declared it blasphemy that Pelagius should call Augustine's authority quite irrelevant in this matter. How far this influenced the course of the negotiations cannot be seen. But Pelagius now found support in the bishop John. For when Orosius continued to reproach Pelagius for teaching that man could be without sin, and the latter confirmed that he did indeed teach so, the bishop came to his aid and declared the proposition to be correct, if one did not say that man could do so without God's help, but considered this help to be necessary. This Pelagius admitted. Now Orosius would not enter into anything further, nor was he well disposed to do so, but demanded that the matter should be referred to the Bishop of Rome, because Pelagius was a member of the Occidental Church. Bishop John agreed to this, but demanded that Pelagius remain silent until a decision was reached.

But this did not happen. Pelagius was not silent, and his opponents also came out against him again. In the same year (415) two Occidental bishops, who were staying in Palestine, drew up a petition of complaint against Pelagius, and the movement became so great that "it was not known how it should end." Therefore fifteen Oriental bishops held a synod at Diospolis, the biblical Lydda. At this second interrogation Pelagius contrived to bring the assembled

to deceive the melted fathers. The charges were not very clear; therefore it was all the easier to give them a tolerable meaning, and to Pelagius' answers the bishops said once and again that his statements were not contrary to the faith of the Church. The charges related to his doctrine of man's capacity for good and of free will. Afterwards he was also to answer some questions about original sin, and some sentences of his friend Cölestius were put before him, which had been rejected in Carthage and in which the latter had denied original sin. To this Pelagius replied that he had not said this, and therefore he need not give an account of it. But in order to satisfy the holy Synod, he pronounced the anathema on all who believed or had ever believed so. With this the Synod was fully satisfied, and Pelagius was dismissed **in pace ecclesiae.** (S. 18.)

Formally, the decision of this synod was correct; on the basis of the explanations given, it could not have been otherwise. But Pelagius had made the matter too easy; they had not gone into the details. Jerome therefore calls the synod a **synodus miserabilis**. Augustine, however, excuses the Fathers assembled there. He points out that they spoke Greek, but Pelagius spoke Latin; and because the mediation of an interpreter was necessary, Pelagius could all the more easily give well-calculated answers, so that his real opinion did not come to light.

Here it will now be in place to go into a little more detail about the character of the man.

Pelagius appears at first as a strict monk who seriously insisted on an outward Christian change. He was therefore, as already said above, also praised by many. Augustine also writes of him at the time, when he had only heard of his activity in Rome, but not of his teaching: "I have seen in him a man filled with the most ardent zeal against those who, in their sins, accuse human nature, and so seek to excuse themselves, while they ought to accuse human will." (p. 4.) Later he writes: "At first the name of Pelagius, who lived in Rome, was mentioned to me with much praise. Later the rumor began to come to us that he was disputing against the grace of God. Although I felt this painfully, and also believed those who reported it, yet I wished to hear something like this either from him myself, or to read it in one of his books, that if I undertook to refute him, he might not be able to deny it." (p. 9.) Still later, he once contrasts the two false teachers, Pelagius and Cölestius, and says, "What other difference will there be between that and Cölestius in this matter than that Cölestius is more open and

Pelagius more hidden, that more obstinate, that more mendacious, that more outspoken, that more devious (**astutior**)?" (p. 11, note.) But this is how Pelagius showed himself at the proceedings at Diospolis, and at any rate Augustin was justified in reproaching him for having condemned himself at that synod, and indeed for having deliberately lied. Because as a rule he talked about grace and free will, and not, like Cölestius, about original sin, one might think that he came to the explicit denial of original sin only later, that is, that he did not come to a different opinion about this piece of doctrine until after that synod. But it is proved (p. 29) that he also denied original sin before that time. Since this happened before as well as after that synod, there is nothing left but to suppose that he, in order to escape condemnation, knowingly told the untruth. He also confirmed it himself, that he dealt there with deceit. He issued after that synod a book on free will, in which he openly denied original sin. When it was afterwards reproached to him how he had been able to prove with anathema those who denied it at Diospolis, that he had therefore committed a fraud there, he said that at the Synod of Diospolis he had condemned those who said that Adam's sin had not harmed the human race. And he stands by that. The first sin had harmed the human race, but not by procreation, but by evil example. Similarly, he admitted that grace was necessary to man, although, as shown above, he considered nature so good that it needed no help at all. But then he did not understand by grace the grace of God in Christ, but either the gift of free will or the revelation of the divine law.

By such deception, then, Pelagius had succeeded in averting the attacks of his opponents in the Orient. In the West, however, the matter did not rest. At a synod at Carthage in 416 the matter was again discussed, and through Orosius the report of those two occidental bishops on the synod of Diospolis was communicated. Remembering the former proceedings against Cölestius, it was now decided that he and Pelagius should be anathematized if they did not recant their heresy, and at the same time it was decided that a letter should be addressed to Innocent I, then bishop of Rome, demanding that he pronounce condemnation on those who ascribed to human nature the power of overcoming sin, and denied the salutary effect of infant baptism, apart from what those two would do. For one was concerned that Pelagius would have numerous followers in Rome, and their efforts were to be countered as far as possible.

How much the Africans cared for the cause is evident from the fact that the bishops of Numidia sent a special letter in

of this matter to Innocent I. The same did even more detailed

five other bishops, including Augustine, who particularly pointed out that Pelagius, or if he had changed, his party, lacked the true concept of grace. The answer of the Bishop of Rome confirmed the judgment of the African bishops, and commended them highly for having appealed to the authority of St. Peter. This, indeed, was felt to be an insolence, but for the sake of the approving answer it was acquiesced in.

But now Pelagius addressed himself to the Roman bishop with a confession of faith. In it he dealt at length with Trinity and Christology, and other things about which there was at present no dispute; but very vaguely he expressed himself on the points just at issue. He now admitted the necessity of infant baptism for the remission of sins, but with the understanding that the doctrine of original sin must not be confirmed thereby. The freedom of the will he asserted, but admitted that man needed the help of God. The longer argument about this still leaves open the possibility that man can be without sin, and explicitly rejects as blasphemy the assertion that God has commanded man to do something impossible.

But before this letter reached Rome, Bishop Innocent died, and under his successor Zosimus the matter took a turn favorable to heresy. Cölestius, who in the meantime had become a presbyter in Ephesus and had then gone to Constantinople, from where he was expelled as a heretic, now came to Rome and also presented a confession of faith to Zosimus. In it, as before in Carthage, he declared the doctrine of original sin to be a **quaestio praeter fidem,** about which he would gladly be instructed by the Roman See, but at the same time he denied it quite definitely. The necessity of infant baptism, even for the remission of sins, he admitted in the same sense as is said above of Pelagius, but added: **peccatum non cum homine nascitur**.

In the negotiations which Zosimus now conducted concerning the doctrinal position of Cölestius and the absent Pelagius, they must have proceeded with strange insincerity and superficiality. Cölestius declared that he condemned all that had been condemned by Innocent, the predecessor of Zosimus, nay, all that the Roman See would condemn. But of his heresy, already condemned by the confirmation of the resolutions of Carthage with that of Pelagius, he evidently retracted nothing; for he would not enter into the accusations there brought against him. Nevertheless, Zosimus was satisfied by the confessions of the two heretics, because they had nowhere disregarded the grace or assistance of God, and sharply rebuked the African bishops for yielding to the accusations of evil-minded men - by which were meant the Gallican bishops who, before the Synod of Diospolis, had been against

Pelagius had occurred - would have given ear against men of so perfect faith without due investigation, and would have stirred up disputes which went beyond the sphere of simple ecclesiastical belief.

The African bishops, of course, did not recognize this decision of Zosimus, but declared at a synod in Carthage that the decision of Innocent should remain until Pelagius and Cölestius would confess the right concept of grace, and communicated this declaration to Zosimus. The latter now already took a step back and wrote that he wished to postpone the settlement of these questions until later, but in doing so talked a great deal about the authority of the Roman See. The Africans, however, did not care for him any further, but held a general council in Carthage (418), at which all the African provinces and also Spain were represented. There the Pelagian heresy was solemnly rejected in eight canons. The most important of these are that men are created mortal, that children have no inherent sin, that the justifying grace only works the forgiveness of sins committed, but does not give the power to avoid future ones. The grace of God helps against sin only through the revelation of the divine will, not through the communication of the power to love what is good. Justifying grace helps to make it easier for man to do what he ought to do by the power of free will; but he can do it without it, only with greater difficulty. The saints, the true children of God, confess themselves sinners only out of humility, and do not need to ask for forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Prayer; they do this only for others.

Now if Bishop Zosimus had already become apprehensive by the former communication from Carthage, he must now become still more so, especially as another influence asserted itself against him. The Emperor Honorius was won over to 'the decision of the African General Council, and issued an edict to the Prefect of Rome, in which he expressed his abhorrence of the new heresy, and gave orders for its authors to be removed from the city. Everyone, it was further said, laymen as well as clergymen, should have the right to accuse the adherents of the false doctrine before the authorities, and those convicted should be expelled from the country. Now Zosimus openly broke with the cause which he had before approved, and Cölestius was called upon to answer. This, however, he now dared not do, but left Rome, and Zosimus expelled from the communion of the Church the two false teachers whom he had shortly before described as "men of so perfect faith."

This judgment of Zosimus, which was also made known in the Oriental churches, the Occidental bishops had to sub-.

write, and this brought the third, most spiritually important representative of Pelagianism on the scene. Bishop Julianus of Eclanum in Apulia refused to sign and had to resign his office. In vain he complained of the decision - in Rome, however, partly - brought about by the secular power; also his demand that a general church assembly be called was unsuccessful. In the correspondence with Augustine which now followed, he sought to establish the Pelagian doctrine more deeply in a rational way. But his cause had to be lost because of its obvious scriptural untruthfulness.

The efforts to suppress Pelagianism, whose adherents, however, as it seems, nowhere formed a schismatic party, were continued. Bonifacius, the successor of Zosimus in the Roman episcopate, entered into intercourse with Augustine, who sent him another writing against heresy. Constantius, Honorius' co-regent, ordered more severe measures against the despisers of grace, especially against Cölestius, the disturber of public peace and religion, who had hitherto escaped punishment. He was expelled from Rome, and whoever gave him refuge was threatened with banishment. However, Constantius' decree does not seem to have been strictly observed.

From this time on, nothing more is reported about Pelagius; he disappears from history. That his doctrine was also rejected by the Orientals, whom he had deceived at Diospolis, at a synod in Antioch, is an isolated, and therefore not certain, piece of news. At the ecumenical council of Ephesus in 431 it was rejected by the whole Church, together with that of Nestorius. In the form, therefore, in which the Pelagian heresy was represented by Pelagius himself and his followers, it was overcome. In a mitigated form, as Semipelagianism, it has, of course, continued to trouble the Church for a long time, and to a certain extent it still has its representatives in all those who do not wish to let the "by grace alone" come into its full rights. F. Z.

## What does Scripture teach about the soul?

(Sent in by resolution of the Middle Conference District of Northern Illinois of H-h.)

1.

If we want to answer this question, it is first necessary to find out in what sense the word "soul" is used in Scripture. If we first take the Old Testament, we find that we first encounter the word soul in the report about the creation of the first humans (Gen. 2, 7).

There it is said: "God made man out of a lump of earth, and breathed into his nostrils the living breath; and so man became a living soul." Obviously already in this first passage the word is not used in its proper sense, but in the figurative sense: "person, being." In Gen. 9:4, 5 we find the same Hebrew word (**nephesh**) used in the sense of "life," v. 4 of the life of animals, v. 5 of the life of man. However, it would lead too far to prove all the different meanings here from the individual passages; we content ourselves here with what Gesenius gives as the meaning of **nephesh** under four points: "1. breath; breath of life; 2. Life, vital force, the principle animating the body (Greek ψυχή, Latin **anima**), which expresses itself by the breath; - further, in reference to all functions by which life is preserved or refreshed, or, on the contrary, suffers, comes into danger; 3. rational soul, mind, heart, especially as the seat of sensations, affects, and internal impulses of various kinds; 4. living being; properly, that wherein is life or soul (**nephesch).**" Similarly the meaning of this word is also given by Fürst, who adds: "The use for person, living being, man, or also slave is as in German." It comes from the verbum **naphasch** = to breathe, to breathe, to live. Likewise says Leopold in his little hand lexicon. - From the foregoing it is evident that from this word and its manifold uses nothing special and exact can be inferred concerning the human soul.

Since we understand by "soul" in the true sense of the word the "spirit" that is inherent in the body, as does the Scripture, we turn to this word. The Hebrew word is **ruach,** and we find it in Genesis 1:2, where it is **ruach elohim**, the spirit of God, and according to the old interpretation, the third person in God. In addition to the fact that this word means "breath, wind, snort," it is also used in the same sense as **nephesh** for "life" and "soul" (**anima**), and also for **animus,** as "spirit, mind, disposition, will, and resolution" (according to Gesenius). But from this word, too, nothing definite can be derived concerning the human soul (spirit), since this word is used, as of the "spirit of man," so also of the "spirit of cattle." For proof we refer only to Ecclesiastes 3:19 ff. (This passage, so often misused and misunderstood, will be considered more closely in the course of this work). It comes from the verb **ruach** = to breathe.

Still a third word we find in the Old Testament, which has the meaning "soul," and which, under certain conditions, may perhaps give us a little more insight into the nature of the human soul; it is the word **neschamah** (in **stat. constr. nischmath**). The presupposition alluded to is this, that the

In a place that is yet to be seen the word nascham does not refer to animals but only to men. It comes from the verb **nascham** = **to** breathe. According to Gesenius it denotes: "1. breath, especially God's breath of wrath (2 Sam. 22, 16; Ps. 18, 16); then God's animating, inspiring breath (Job 33, 4); 2. breath; the animating principle in the human body; 3. living being = **nephesh**; 4. reasonable soul." According to Fürst it denotes "especially the sensible soul." Leopold remarks under the meaning **"spiritus": *Dei, hominis.***

Since this word occurs only 24 times in the Old Testament, I compared the individual passages. The result is as follows: 1. **Neshamah** is spoken of God seven times; it designates the spirit that goes out from God, partly as invigorating, refreshing, enlightening, partly as corrupting and punishing. These seven passages are: Job 4:9; 32:8; 33:4; 37:10; Isa. 30:33; 2 Sam. 22:16; Ps. 18:16. - 2. In sixteen passages it is used of men without contradiction. In all these places it may well be translated "spirit, soul." In two of these passages (Isa. 2:22 and Dan. 10:17) it might perhaps be more appropriately rendered in German as "breath"; but equally, or more in accordance with the Hebrew, as "spirit" or "soul." Seb. Schmid (**Bibl, lat.**) gives it in both places with spiritus, resp. **anima**. These sixteen passages are: Gen. 2, 7; Deut. 20, 16 (cf. v. 18; Jos. 11, 11. 14); Jos. 10, 40; (cf. Deut. 20, 16); Jos. 11, 11. 14; 1 Kings 16, 29; 17, 17; Job 26, 4; 27, 3; 34, 14; Ps. 150, 6; Isa. 2, 22; 42, 6; 67, 16; Dan. 10, 17; Prov. 20, 27. - 3. The 24th place might be in dispute, namely Gen. 7, 22, whether this word is here to be applied to men and cattle, or to men only. In such doubtful cases the exegetical rule applies that the usage of the language must decide. And the usage of the language decides that also here **neschamah** is to be understood only of men. For we have seen that in all other passages, where the word is not used of God, it is used of men, and not of animals. For this reason already it can no longer be doubtful that also Gen. 7, 22 refer to men. In addition to this, immediately before (v. 21) man is mentioned last, and following this word the text (v. 22) continues: "**omnis qui** (not **omne quod) habebat nischmath ruach chajim in naribus suis**". By this emphatic addition the Holy Spirit undoubtedly wants to emphasize that not even a single person who still had his soul in his body escaped the judgment of the flood of sin. Moreover, the wording clearly points to Gen. 2, 7 (**inspiravit in nares ejus n- math chajim**), where the creation of man is described. Language use, context and wording (parallelism) are but three weighty witnesses; and the unanimous testimony of the same

is that also Gen. 7, 22 **neschamah** can only be understood of men. 4. - (4) From what has been said it is evident that **neshamah** is used only in reference to God and to men, but never in reference to animals. But this sets up a twofold point: first, the fact that it is used only of God and of men shows that there is a certain similarity between the spirit of God and the spirit of man. This is also confirmed by the doctrine of Scripture, that God created man in His image and immortality, also endowed him with the faculty of the knowledge of God. Secondly, the exclusive use of this word emphasizes the difference between the animal soul and the soul of man: the Holy Spirit does not designate both by **neschamah**, but only the soul of man. Therefore there must be a difference between the two. These preliminary conclusions from the word itself are fully confirmed by the predicates which we find in connection with this word in Scripture.

However, before we examine the more specific statements of individual passages in the Old Testament, let us see in what sense "soul" and "spirit" are used in the New Testament.

The New Testament word for soul is ψυχ***ή,*** which corresponds to the Hebrew **nephesh** (the LXX have rendered **nephesh** by ψυχή throughout, with few exceptions). It comes from ψύχω = **to** breathe. Curtius traces it to a Sanskrit root **sphu** = **to** blow. It denotes at first the breath, the breath of animal life. Already in the usage of Homer it denotes "the life in the particular of the individual being, namely of man" (Cremer, Wörterb.). With and since Plato "the conception extends to the fact that ψυχή is the ethically predisposed individuality of man, outlasting death" (ib.). "Thus, then, the Greek ψυχή corresponded to the meaning of **nephesh,** and the LXX could readily use the word." This use of ψυχή in the Greek Old Testament is followed by the usage of the New Luxn Testament. Here it denotes 1 Apoc. 8, 9 and 16, 3 evidently animal individuals; 2. in Old Testament quotations (Matt. 12, 18) God: the Father as a distinct person, distinguished from the Son and Holy Spirit; 3. in the other passages it is used of men, and a. in the sense of the life proper to the individual (Matt. 2, 20; Rom. 11, 3; Matt. 20, 28; Act. 27, 10. 22; st al.); b. as subject of life = person, the I (Matth. 10, 28: ψυχή as against σώμα***;*** Matth. 16, 24: **εαυτόν,** cf. Luk. 14, 26: την ***έαυτοϋ ψυχήν;*** Matth. 16, 26 and Mark 8, 36: **την *ψυχήν αυτόν***, cf. Luk. 9, 25: εαυτόν***)***, both in this life and after the same (Apoc. 6, 9). - From this comparison it follows for our purpose that ψυχή when used of men may denote both the animal (earthly) life and the

whole person, the I of man. The respective context explains the meaning of the word all by itself.

The other New Testament word under consideration here is πνεύμα = spirit. It comes from πνέω = ***to*** blow, to breathe; "it corresponds fully to the Hebrew **ruach**" (id.). Where **πνεύμα** is not used in the physical sense = wind (Heb. 1:7), or of God (2 Thess. 2:8: ***τό πνεύμα άγιον)***, it denotes in man 1. the soul, as a synonymon of ψυχή (Luk. 8, 55: ***έπέστρεψεν τό πνεύμα αυτής;*** Jas. 2, 26; **σώμα *χωρίς πνεύματος νεκρόν;*** cf. Matth. 27, 50; Act. 7, 59. on this Luk. 1, 46: **μεγαλύνει *ή ψυχή μου*** with v. 47: **τό *πνεϋμά μου;*** also Joh. 12, 27 with 13, 21); 2. insonder heit the actual self-conscious inwardness; that which lives in man in contrast with his **σώμα,** his σάρξ***;*** cf. 1 Cor. 5, 5; Rom. 8, 10. 11; 1 Petr. 4, 6; 1 Cor. 2, 11; especially 2 Cor. 12, 2. 3; Apoc. 1, 10; 21, 10.

Cremer states, "If we realize that soul and spirit may well be distinguished, but cannot, as soul and body, spirit and body, be divorced from each other, . . then we shall have to distinguish πνεύμα **(roach**) as the principle of life from the ψυχή **(nephesch)** as the subject of life; but the soul carries the πνεύμα within itself. . . . As then regards the relation of πνεύμα and, . . the relation should become clear as follows: The spirit principle, the soul subject, the heart central and organ of life." (l. c., p. 887 sq.) From this it is evident that πνεύμα in man denotes the spirit of life (cf. Apoc. 11, 11), the very principle of life, which even in German cannot always be called "soul," but is immanent in the soul, by which the soul lives. It is only by the predicates about the human πνεύμα that the more exact can be discerned. But it is a curious circumstance, which deserves all notice, that in the whole New Testament πνεύμα is never used of animals. Where it denotes a living creature, it is said either of God or of men.

2.

After the previous preliminary remarks, we will now proceed to the actual answer to our question by compiling several statements of Scripture concerning the human soul (spirit) understood under the terms given above. The first thing that we must state on the basis of Scripture (however self-evident it may seem to a Christian) is the truth that man has a soul or spirit distinct from the body. This becomes immediately clear to us when we hear the short account of the creation of man: Gen. 2:7: God "formed (fashioned, **jazar**) man dust (**afar)** out of (from) the earth, and breathed into his nostrils (face) the spirit of life; and so (**vav**

**consec.**) man became a living soul. "Hebrews observes that in the word **vajjizer** a double **jot is** put (since according to the rule it should be a simple jot and a double **zere**) to indicate the twofold creation of man: the earthly of the body, and the heavenly of the soul." . . . Of the body it is said: the Lord formed it; of the soul: he breathed into it; **naphach** actually means: he blew into it, breathed (Is. 54, 16). Thus the creation of the rational soul is here figuratively signified, as Alcuin already says. For it is said that God breathed into him the spirit of life, that is, the soul, which gives life, feeling, and motion to the body, so that by this blowing man became a living soul, a living creature, partaker of soulish life through the soul, which is the principle of life, 1 Cor. 15:45." (**Gerh., Comm. ad Gen.**) By describing to us here from the Holy Spirit the creation or formation of the body first, and only afterwards the filling of the body with the spirit of life, he intimates that man is a being composed of two quite distinct parts. The body was formed of earth; after the body was finished, there was as yet no life in it; only then did God create the soul (the spirit) and give it the body for a dwelling-place and organ. It is not stated whether the soul was also created out of a pre-existing substance; but by the "blowing in" or "breathing" the impression is given that the spirit was brought forth out of nothing by an immediate act of creation, as also this, that only by the entrance of the spirit of life into the body did the latter come into life and motion. Everything shows, then, that the soul is a being distinct from the body, which does not need the body for its existence.

Against the misconception that the life-spirit is an outflow from the essence of God, and that pantheism is taught here, it must be briefly remarked that such a view is contrary to all scriptural teaching. If we, like God the Son, were essential children of God, and if the breathing in, or going out, of the spirit of life from God signified the same thing that takes place from the Father and the Son in relation to the Holy Spirit, it would be impossible for us to sin. For we also would be God, gods; but an essential God cannot do sin ("**Christus non potuit peccare**"). But besides, the going forth of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son is an act of the divine essence, without which the true God cannot be conceived; but the breathing in of the human spirit of life was an act of the will: God might as well have omitted it as done it. Further, it was a momentary act, while the going forth of the Holy Ghost is eternal as God. Finally, to leave aside other passages which describe man as a creature, but not as God, it is said of this very spirit of life (**neschamah**) Isa.

57, 16: "I (the Lord) have made them (the souls of men)" (**asiti bon asah**), thus created, which could not be said of the Holy Spirit and also of essential outpourings (children) of God. (To this Act. 17, 28; because here the context and parallels - 2 Petr. 1, 3 ff. - give a completely different meaning).

There may be room here for a quotation from John Gerhard, who says about the reproduction of the soul: "One of the most noble reasons given against the immortality of the soul is that the soul is produced by the substance and reproduced by procreation. Answer: To speak properly, the soul is not begotten, but propagated; for 'to be begotten' is the predicate of the whole man after body and soul. But it does not follow from the fact that the soul is reproduced that it is also perishable. For the nature of the soul is not to be judged from procreation, but from its very essence; and this is that it is a bodiless, invisible, and immortal spirit. For every thing is such as God intended it to be at creation, and such as he gave it to be. If by 'coming into being through matter' it is understood that the soul comes into being from bodily seed as such, then we deny that the soul is brought into being through matter. If, however, this expression is explained to the effect that man, by virtue of divine blessing, begets something similar to himself after his own kind, and thus propagates the soul, we admit that the soul is brought forth by virtue of matter, that is, is not directly created by God, but is propagated from parents to offspring by virtue of divine order and blessing. But from this it cannot be concluded that the soul cannot exist outside the body, because both, namely, both the procreation of the soul and its existence outside the body, are wholly and solely dependent on the order and will of God." Then follows in Gerhard a beautiful quotation from Irenaeus, wherein the latter shows that other creatures, which also have a beginning, yet exist eternally according to God's order and will. (**Gerh., Loci VIII, p.** 106.)

By the way, the point of view of Scripture is that of Traducianism, but not of Creatianism. This is evident from a compilation of scriptural passages such as Job 14:4 ("out of the unclean cannot come the clean"), John 3:6 ("that which is born of the flesh", where the Lord understands by "flesh" the whole sinful nature in contrast to the Spirit of God and the new spiritual being of the Christian born of Him); cf. That Luther in 1545 also seemed to take this standpoint is proved by the quotation in **Baieri Comp. (ed. Walther**) II, p. 100: "**Qui cogitaverunt, animam ex traduce esse, videntur non penitus aliena**

a Scripturis sensisse." However, we say with Joh. Gerhard, "Modum propagationis inquirendum philosophis relinquimus." (ib., p. 101.)

About the question "dichotomy or trichotomy?" the following is to be noted. On the basis of such passages, in which spirit and soul are mentioned next to each other, as it were opposite each other, one has often in the church and even more often in Christian philosophy (cf. Göschel, Der Mensch nach Leib, Seele und Geist) made a threefold division of man. Thus it is said, e. g., 1 Thess. 5:23, "Let your spirit be kept whole, together with soul and body," etc., and Heb. 4:12, "The word of God ... pervades until it divides soul and spirit ... and is a judge of the thoughts and senses of the heart." The simplest understanding is that "soul and spirit" refers to the entire inwardness of man. One can, after all, distinguish between soul and spirit conceptually in the way that has been done above. But seen in terms of the substance of man, soul and spirit is always a thing in contrast to the body, as then in so many places spirit and soul are used **promiscuously.** Thus, most of our Lutheran teachers choose the dichotomistic view as the one that corresponds to Scripture.

Scripture also teaches us that the soul does not need the body for its existence. This is irrefutably clear from such sayings in which, while man was still living on earth, an absence, resp. separation of the soul from the body is stated, or at least presented as possible. Except for Apok. 21, 10, which passage might be doubted, we have 2 Cor. 12, 2. 3 a statement of the apostle himself. He does not speak of what will take place after his death or after the last day, but of what took place with himself fourteen years ago. "He was raptured into paradise." Paradise in the New Testament denotes only the heaven of the blessed, as a comparison of the passages easily and strikingly proves: Luk. 23, 43; Apoc. 2, 7: opposed to the other death, hell, v. 11. Now the apostle says, "He was raptured into paradise," he, that is, the I, the person of man. Further, "Whether he was in the body, I know not, or whether he was out of the body, I know not." Thus, then, he sets up the possibility that the I, the actual person-forming thing, the soul (spirit) of man, may very well be outside the body. For if this were not possible, the apostle speaking by the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:13) would very well have known that he had not been outside the body fei. And could he also be alive, perceive, etc., outside the body? Indeed; for "he heard unspeakable words," and calls this rapture a "revelation" and a "vision," v. 4. 1. Thus, then, he must have been able to hear, to see, to perceive, whether he was in the body or not. Thus it is evidently taught, that our spirit, our proper-.

I, can also be, exist, hear, see, perceive, feel outside of the body.

Before proceeding to the main point in this inquiry, the proof of the immortality of the human soul, let us briefly attempt to fix the difference between the soul of man and the soul of animals.

(1) Concerning the creation. The Scriptures describe the creation of animals as an act of God, which happened through the agency of the water, resp. the earth: "The water stirred itself up with" etc.; "the earth brought forth", Gen. 1, 20. 24. The word of the Lord stirred up the water, gave the earth power to bring forth animals. These animals of the water and earth are called **nephesh chaja (anima vivens**), as man, chap. 2, 7, is called a living being. But they had their life, their **nephesh,** directly from the water, resp. the earth, admittedly by virtue of the divine word. But of the creation of man the Holy Spirit tells us that God Himself, directly, both formed the body and directly, not through the mediation of a creature, breathed in the **neschamah chajim**, the spirit of life. This immediacy of the divine creation of the human soul stands out clearly Isa. 57, 16: **anochi asiti, Ego ipse feci**. On closer comparison, there is no trace that the **nephesh of the** animals is an independent being, which would even be conceivable without the body, but certainly the spirit of man, through which the body first receives life.

(2) What man was created in, is then impressed upon us with repeated emphasis in Gen. 1, 26. 27, namely in God's image, likeness and likeness; he was to be the image of God. That this divine image consisted of holiness, righteousness and the blessed knowledge of God is taught to us by the Holy Spirit through the apostle Eph. 4, 24 and Col. 3, 10. But where there is holiness and righteousness, there is also eternal life; for death is only the wages of sin (unholiness, etc.), Rom. 6, 16.Only through sin did death come into the world, Rom. 5, 12. If God created man in holiness and righteousness, He created him with it and through it to eternal life and freedom from all death, therefore also to immortality. - This is not said of the animals; rather, the purpose of their creation is stated to be the service of man. For to man the LORD said, "Have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that creeps upon the earth." Gen. 1, 28. - Cremer remarks with reference to Gen. 1, 20-28: "***Ψυχή ζώσα*** is now given just as both to man

than the animal: Gen. 1, 24; 2, 7; 9, 10. 16; Lev. 17, 10. 11. 14. 15. But man is nevertheless special: Gen. 1, 26. 27. Compare ch. 2, 20 in Heb. and in

of the LXX: Among the beasts was found nothing like or resembling man: ***ὁμοιος,* kenegedo,** corresponding to him. And this
He is not a product of God's life, which governs and determines the whole creation, like the animals (Gen. 1, 24; cf. v. 2); he is not a product of nature brought forth by the spirit of God (Col. 3, 19 f.), but he has received it in a special way through a special, unmediated divine communication. The principle of life that is active in nature, as the spirit of God's Spirit, is independently opposed to the principle of life that is active in man, likewise the spirit of God's Spirit." (Dictionary, p. 888.) On this subject compare what has been remarked above about **neschamah.**

3. A third difference is that the soul of man is endowed with reason, which according to the testimony of Scripture the animal lacks. 2 Pet. 2, 12 (Jude 10) it is said of the seducers: ***ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα γεγεννημένα φυσικά εις ἅλωσιν και φθοράν.*** In these words we are given the purpose and "soulish" nature of animals: they are produced by nature for the purpose (willed by God) that they may serve for food, etc., to man. But then they are called ***ἄλογα***, unreasonable, and therefore have no reason. Here arises the question, so variously answered, what reason is. We define reason as the faculty of inferring supersensible objects or causes from sensually perceptible objects or facts. With this definition we stand on the ground of Scripture: Rom. 1, 19-21; Act. 17, 27; 14, 17 **et al**. Reason is the sense of metaphysics. Specifically, then, with respect to God, it is the faculty of knowing God's existence, nature, and attributes (first from nature). Paul attributes this ability to all men, Rom. 1, 19 ff. Whoever does not make the right use of this ability, like 2 Petr. 2, 12 the false teachers and blasphemers who tempt to godlessness, or like those who "say in their heart: There is no God" (Ps. 14), is called a fool, a fool who denies his reason and equates himself to the "unreasonable cattle".

Reason as a faculty of the independent spirit of man is described Job 32, 8: "The spirit (of God) is in man, and the spirit of the Almighty (**nischmath shaddai)** makes them understand" (gives them faculty to understand). Likewise Prov. 20, 27: "A light from Jehovah (**ner Jehovah**) is the soul of man (**nischmath ha-adam**); searching through (pondering) all the chambers of the inmost (= the inmost being, or the inmost heart)." The spirit of man seeks, "must search" (Ps. 77, 7), seeks to fathom all things, is a light, if only to be compared to a candle (**ner),** from the LORD! Hence he is also able to "reason, lukewarm-.

tere milk" of divine revelation - provided that the Holy Spirit exercises his restorative power upon the light of reason, darkened and corrupted by sin, but not destroyed. Nowhere, however, is a knowledge of God said of animals. True, "the young ravens call upon him," Ps. 147:9; "the cattle sigh," Joel 1:18; "the wild beasts cry unto God," v. 20; yea, not the beasts alone, but "all creatures groan, writhing in birth pains, longing with head bowed down for the revelation of the glory of the children of God," Rom. 8:19. 22; but since it is established of animals that they are unreasonable, we must necessarily understand all such statements to mean that such calling, groaning, longing, rejoicing (Ps. 98, 8), accusing (Hab. 2, 11a), rejoicing (Isa. 55, 12) on the part of the creature, also of the animals, is an unconscious one, and just as in the case of "streams of water", "masonry stones", "mountains" etc. (see the passages in question), also in the case of animals no soul consciousness is presupposed or indicated. But why then such predicates of them? Answer: Scripture is God's Word; so also creatures are described to us as God looks upon them (or, in anthropopathic terms, according to the feelings they excite in God). For example, when iniquity abounds in covetousness, God is moved to anger and punishment by looking at the objects of human covetousness, "the stones and the beams of houses," Hab. 2:11a; when he looks at the earth that received Abel's blood at Cain's hands, the LORD hears the voice of such blood crying for vengeance (Gen. 4); does he look upon the creation as it has been since the sin of man under the curse, in dpr "bondage of vanity and corruption," that is, of sin, of the abuse of sinful men (to ματαιότης, Rom. 8, 20, cf. Rom. 1, 21; Eph. 4, 17 ff.), lies, he feels compassion for the creature subjected to the service of sin and ruin; and since he has decreed its renewal and rebirth (Ps. 102, 27; 104, 29. 30; Isa. 65, 17; 66, 22; 2 Pet. 3, 13; Matth. 19, 28 **et al.**), she appears before him in her present misery like a woman in childish distress, waiting with eager longing for the day of blessed joy. Especially to Rom. 8, 19 ff. still the remark, that here the apostle sums up, as it were, the statements of the Old Testament which have been mentioned before, as indeed he represents v. 22 with πάσα ***ἡ κτίσις*** the whole creation as it were as one person. And on the ground of such sayings he can also say(we know), similarly as we also say, We know that God's word and sacrament is not without fruit.

In connection with this, it should be noted that, as far as man is concerned, the resurrection of the body, or rather its reunion with the soul, has been decided and revealed by God. The same man,

who lives in this eon will also live in the future eon, and it will be the same soul, but also the same body. But of the creature it is only said that it will be renewed after it has passed through the fire (2 Peter 3). That the same animals will be present on the new earth that lived here on earth, the Scriptures do not know the least thing about it. To suppose a resurrection of the beasts is almost to put them on a level with men, even in respect to immortality. Moreover, that the Scripture is silent about this, and says not a word about animals on the new earth, it teaches that the life of the animals (their **nephesh, ruach**) ceases with their death. For it is said of this **nephesh,** Lev. 17, 11. 14, that it is in the blood of the animals; with the shedding of the blood, therefore, the animal soul ceases to exist. This passage also tells us why the blood of the animals was forbidden to the Israelites: it was sanctified to the Lord; it was given to the Israelites by God "for an altar, that their souls might be reconciled therewith". But as a sanctuary of the Lord it was not allowed to be used for profane purposes.

4. Ecclesiastes 3, 18-21 is especially misused by unbelievers who are still somewhat familiar with the bible to show that the bible does not make a difference between man and animal, at least not regarding the state after death. And if we look at this passage superficially, it almost seems as if there were good reason to say nothing in reply to such blasphemy. For there it is said: "Man is like cattle: as these die, so dies he also, and all have the same breath; and man has nothing more than cattle, for all is vain. All things come to one place; all things are made of dust, and return to dust. Who knoweth whether the breath of man goeth upward, and the breath of cattle goeth downward under the earth?" "A preacher of the freethinkers once read this passage to a large assembly of the people, and then said derisively, to the roaring applause of the crowd, that the Bible sometimes went among the freethinkers. For the sake of this passage, Koheleth also suffered the ignominy of being a favorite book of Voltaire and Frederick the Great, who, of course, also appreciated the governmental wisdom contained in the book. Yes, devout literary scholars, such as Hengstenberg and Hahn, were so afraid of it that they tried to force a different meaning into it through artificial exegesis. Hengstenberg translates: 'Who knows the spirit of the children of men, him who ascends upward, and the spirit of cattle, him who descends downward to the earth?' Cock almost likewise: 'as him that,' etc. They thus do away with the doubt (offence), and let Koheleth here say, 'Yea, the spirit of man hath a glorious preference over the soul of beast; it ascends upward, and it descends downward.' The Masorah has also punctuated thus; it has, says Ewald, twice changed the interrogative **ha** im into the article ('the' instead of

(The English Bible also translates according to the Masorah, as does Hengstenberg. (The English Bible also translates according to the Masorah as Hengstenberg does.) But the old translations, from the LXX to Luther, put here the doubtful question demanded by the grammatical construction and the context: Who knows whether the Spirit, etc. . . . (Greve, **Coheleth**, p. 60.)

If we want to understand the passage correctly, we must first of all pay attention to the scopus of the whole book and then to the exact wording of the passage itself. (1) The purpose of the whole book, if we examine it more closely, is evidently no other than to show men quite clearly the futility and transitoriness of the present eon, so that man may not set his heart on this world and its joys when he is doing well, but also so that he may not despair and lose his equanimity when he has to suffer and endure many things from the earth. For everything, be it laughter or weeping, has its time; nothing lasts forever that belongs to this world. "**Vanitas, vanitatum vanitas**" is the signature of this world. And following this, Koheleth points to the future eon, especially to the judgment before which every man must appear after this life; see especially the conclusion, 11, 9; 12, 1. 7. 14; comp. also 4, 17. Now, if it be the intention of Solomon to exhort man not to let his heart be taken up with the things of this world, but to prepare himself for the world to come, it would be the height of folly to think that in any part of the book he intended to deny the world to come in relation to man. For for what purpose should man still prepare himself to come before God, if there were no world to come for him, and therefore no judgment? So foolish was not the wisest of men, much less the Holy Spirit speaking through him, that he would have come into contradiction with himself (say, in the manner of a "higher critic"). (2) Nor does the exact wording of the full passage (3, -22) afford the slightest occasion for being upset and finding materialism in these words. The following is the most faithful wording possible: V. 18: "I spake in mine heart concerning the manner of the children of men: they For a distinction (particularity) hath God made, and yet for a standing, that they cattle they seem unto themselves. V. 19: For the fate of the children of men is also the fate of cattle, and is a destiny to them: as this dies, so dies that (or: as the one, so dies the other), and one spirit (Odem, **ruach**) is to them all, and a preference have not men over cattle; for all is void (**habel**, perishable). V. 20: All these are wandering after one place; all these are made of dust, and all these return to the dust. V. 21: He that knoweth the spirit of the children of men, whether it ascendeth up on high, and the spirit of cattle, whether it descendeth down on high.

going down to the earth? V. 22: Therefore I have seen that nothing is good (better) than that a man should rejoice in his work (or possessions); for this is his portion; for who shall lead him to see the things that shall come to pass after him?" As we see at once in this most exact rendering of the Hebrew wording, the very beginning, v. 18, decides the meaning of the whole passage. Solomon set up contemplations in his heart concerning the nature or essence (**al-dibrath, from dabar, λο}Ός)** of men. First, he observes that God, however, has made men to differ, to "set apart." And for distinction from whom did he make them? From whom or from what did he set them apart? Of course from the cattle, from the beasts (**behemah**), as is irrefutably evident from the following words. He thus states in these words that a distinction was set by God between men and cattle. By the **vav adversativum** (or rather **vav restrictivum,** since it is to introduce a restriction of the statement made) he now emphasizes over against it how it has the "appearance" or appearance (**aspectus)** in this vain world, so that from reason, which can only conclude from what is perceptible to the senses, no one can say that there is any essential difference between men and cattle. - In the whole passage, therefore, there is an unspoken warning not to judge by outward appearances, but to get the right instruction from the word of Him who created men in this way.

Luther gives the meaning as follows: "It may be said in general that the whole being under the sun, the world and the children of Adam, can be regarded as if they were cattle. . . No man on earth, here under the sun, can by human reason comprehend, know, or believe an eternal life, and that the soul shall not die. For if reason, human wisdom, and the five senses should judge, see, and feel as they please, we feel nothing but that a man dies, decays, and becomes dust like cattle; they also both have the same breath, in which there seems to be no difference. If God did not enlighten his faithful by the Holy Spirit, as by a new light, no one could say by reason that there is any difference between men and cattle. For both are of dust, and return to dust. And because both go to the same place, there is equality between man and beast. Not that it is so, but the world and human reason, seeing that one dies like the other, and that one is like the other, cannot think otherwise. But if any man believe or hold any other higher thing, there pertaineth the Holy Ghost unto it, and a higher light and knowledge, than is under the sun, or in the world." (Eberle, Luth. Ps. 111, 72.)

I would also point out that in this passage our ignorance of the spirit of cattle is also expressed: Who knows whether the spirit of cattle descends to the earth? No one can assert from his empirical perception, that is, from his reason, either the mortality or the immortality of the animal soul.

John Gerhard comments on this passage: "Solomon is speaking of the natural and experiential knowledge that man gains from observing what happens to men and cattle alike. For according to appearance there seems to be no difference between men and cattle. But from the revealed word we know by spiritual knowledge that there is a very great difference in the death of man and cattle, since man's soul is immortal and his body will be raised from the dust of the earth in its own time, neither of which happens to cattle. That Solomon does not wish to deny or deprive man of this spiritual knowledge of the immortality of the soul, is evident from ch. 12:7: 'The spirit returns to God who gave it.' " (**Loc. de morte**, § 152.)

(Conclusion follows.)

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. Synodal Report of the Texas District, with excellent doctrinal treatises on "the life of the Patriarch Joseph." (12 Cts.)

2. Synodical Report of the Nebraska District, containing a thorough paper on the subject, "The Parables of the Lord of the Beginning, Development, and Completion of the Kingdom of God from Earth." (21 Cts.)

3. "Thy Kingdom Come!" Missionary Lectures, collected by Father H. Meyer. (20 Cts.) We also wish this second booklet a wide circulation. It offers the following lectures: 1. The Spread of Christianity in the First Two Centuries († G. Schaller). 2. Lecture on the Inner Mission of our Synod (Fr. Pfotenhauer). 3. Why do we do English mission (C. Gausewitz)? 4th Lecture on City Mission (F. W. Herzberger). 5. lecture on the foreign language missions of the Missouri Synod (H. Birkner). 6. The Indian Mission of our Synod (R. A. Karpinsky). 7. From our emigrant mission (O. H. Restin). 8. The pioneer of the Lutheran heathen mission (R. Kretzschmar). F. B.

**Anthology of characteristic preludes** to the most common chorales of the Lutheran Church. Volumes 1-6. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo.

This great work of its kind will be published in three issues: "Issue H. 13 issues of about 48 pages each. Every month about two issues or a double issue sent postage paid. Price: H10.00. Issue 6. 13 issues, as in Issue H, but in two **Flexible Pebble Cloth-covered bindings**, leased until August 1, 1910. Price: H12.00 postage paid. Issue 8. As in Issue C, but in the best **Seal-Grain leather binding**. Price: $13.50 postage free." Six issues with 305 prelims have been published to date. **Concordia Publishing House** says of this anthology, "This collection of preludes will comprise approximately 624 pages of clean lithography, each plate approximately 10½X7½ inches note-

The organ is printed on a sheet of about 14 x 11 inches, the size of American **sheet music**, only in landscape format instead of portrait format. There are nearly 700 preludes, some easy, others less easy and only a few difficult to perform for organists of average talent and skill, but to the most used chorales always several preludes. All the pieces have a churchly character, indeed they bear a distinctly Lutheran stamp, without exposing themselves to the accusation of pedantry. Most of them are short, that is, short enough not to lose the essential quality of a prelude, but a few festive preludes are long enough to deserve the name Festvorspiel. Most are taken from the works of tried masters of ecclesiastical organ mufic, but pleasing samples of recent American Lutheran composers were safely allowed to be included; for we need by no means be ashamed of the achievements of our more distinguished composers." - Every congregation should purchase this noble and rich value s for its organist. F. B.

**Homiletisches Reallexikon nebst Index Rerum**. By E. Eckhardt.

G. Success Printing Co., St. Louis, Mo. price: P2.40 postpaid. To be obtained from the author, Rev. E. Eckhardt, Blair, Neb. In the circular to his subscribers, Rev. Eckhardt says: "It is with thanksgiving to God that I let the third volume of this work go forth. God has given me the necessary health, money and everything I need for this work. Now we are half finished. The other half of the work will, I hope, succeed in the same way. We have the best prospects for it. In the alphabet, of course, I have made only one letter's progress. Some people might be frightened by this and think that this could go on for another fifteen years. That would be bad for me and for all our wallets. But' I have put many, many things from later letters into the 'G', e.g. stealing into the seventh, killing, war, unforgiveness into the fifth commandment, incarnation into birth, etc.. This has made the 'G' very thick for me. Also in Stock's lexicon you will find that the first letters A to G incl. take up over half his book. The H, which is already written, covers about 100 pages. Three more volumes will follow, to be published within the next three years." We are pleased that the completion of this extremely practical work is now financially assured, and wish the author further luck and success in his diligent, laborious work. F. B.

**Plain Words**. Sermons and addresses by Georg Müller, former preacher at Bristol. With a portrait of Georg Müller. Authorized translation. Published by Richard Mühlmann in Halle a. S. Price: M. 1.60; hardcover: M. 2.40.

These reflections by Georg Müller, who became world famous for his orphanages, deal with the following themes and texts: Naaman and Gehazi, 2 Kings 5. the LORD is my shepherd, Ps. 23. open wide thy mouth, let me fill it! Pf. 81, 11. rely on the LORD! Prov. 3, 5-17. the prayer of the Lord, Matth. 6, 5-15. the lost sheep; the prodigal son, Luk. 15. good news, 1 Cor. 15, 1-4. resurrection of the body, 2 Cor. 5, 1-10. the apostle Paul's stake in the flesh, 2 Cor. 12, 7-10. I boast of the cross of Christ, Gal. 6, 14. Christ, the sinner's refuge, 1 Tim. 1, 15. 16. The God of all grace will make you complete, 1 Pet. 5, 10. Behold, what love! 1 Joh. 3, 1-3, The elect of the Lamb, Joh. 7, 9-17. These reflections are interesting because Georg Mueller repeatedly speaks about his conversion, his Christian life and especially his work with the orphans. And even though Müller is not free of unhealthy Methodism, one has to give him credit for emphasizing again and again, in forceful and simple words, the truth that man attains forgiveness without any works of his own, only through faith in Christ. The orphanages which Müller has built at Ashly Down in Bristol can accommodate 2050 orphans together with 112 helpers and officials and have so far educated over 10,000 orphans. With reference to the maintenance of these institutions, Müller says: "All in all, in answer to my prayer, God has given me 28,320,000

Marks given, without my having approached a single human being with a request." "For my own part, I am a poor, wretched, sinful man! If I received according to merit, I would get nothing but hell. But stand what God has given to a poor, miserable, sinful man, all for Christ's sake! I rely on him. Therefore, for Christ's sake, he has given me these things. And what he has given me, he will also give you. O, expect blessings from him, and he will not withhold them from you if you seek him in earnest prayer. " F. B.

**Queen Luise**. A picture of her life. Drawn in her memory for the German people by Hermann Petri ch. Agency of the Rough House, Hamburg. Price: paperback 80 Ps., hardcover M. 1.50.

This tastefully decorated booklet describes the life of the modest, sunny, intelligent, far-sighted Queen of Prussia, who was honored by much tribulation. Referring to the consolation which Luise drew from God's Word in her affliction, especially from the 126th Psalm, the author remarks: "It is, after all, with the dear Word of God as with the bare piece of gold. As long as it lies in the box, it certainly has its value. But it is only when it comes out and is converted into all kinds of useful goods at the merchant's, that one discovers how great it is. It is only when the beautiful sayings and songs have gained form and reality in living men that their meaning and truth can be rightly discerned, for only for life are they said. In trouble the gold comes out of the box, and in affliction God's word turns into nourishing bread." It is a pity that the writer did not also include testimonies of Luisen's faith in the Saviour of sinners. F. B.

**Old and New Morality**. By Reinhold Seeberg. Agency of the Rough House, Hamburg. Price: M. 1.

The so-called "new morality," which knows how to make propaganda for itself by means of misunderstood catchwords, such as personalism, cultivation of individuality, etc., throws overboard the old morality as it is contained in the ten commandments, and especially in the sixth, and teaches that man does not need to do anything to his nature, i. e., to his lusts and drives, but rather has a full right to "live himself out. Seeberg presents this new doctrine according to its origin, essence, and consequences, while at the same time pointing out the contradictions in which this "new morality" entangles itself, and emphasizes that only law and gospel can help here. Seeberg himself is a modern theologian and proud of it, as is also evident from this writing. But his argument against the folly of the new moralists has not gained by this. Even in the struggle against the crass excesses of the moderns, the old theology performs the right services.

F. B.

**News from the time of persecution of the Lutheran congregation of Luzine.** Put into print by their present pastor, Johannes Nagel. Published by the Lutheran Book Society in Elberfeld. Price: 50 Pf.

These most interesting "News" from the years of persecution from 1830 to 1839 were written down between 1840 to 1846. "On purpose" - says Father Nagel - "everything is left as the narrators dictated it to the collector in his pen at the time." To his report the unknown author of the "Nachrichten" has given the following heading: "True news of penalties suffered in money, distraints, and imprisonment for faithful and constant confession of the doctrine of JEsu Christ, which affected the members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, who gathered as a small beginning of the Lutheran Church in Luzine, a village of Trebnitzer Kreis in the Breslauer Regierungsbezirk." Attached to the "News" as an "Appendix" are several documents from the archives of the High Church College in Breslau, which also show how disgracefully and tyrannically the faithful Lutherans were treated by the Prussian government, because they could not join the Union Church because of their conscience. F. B.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**Concerning the relationship of the Ohio Synod to the Hermannsburg Missionary Society,** the Ohio "Church Newspaper" writes (p. 115): "Among us, who have no heathen mission of our own, funds are annually collected for the heathen mission. We send these funds to the Hermannsburg Missionary Society, because in our judgment this is the best society of its kind. This is not to declare that we are satisfied with this society in every respect. In some respects we would find fault. One of the two directors of this society is taken from the Hanoverian Church, and in the missionary authority there are other men from this church. These facts have not been considered by our Synod as a compelling reason why we should not transmit funds to the Hermannsburg Society. The matter has been thoroughly discussed by the various districts of our Synod, and the result ascertained at the last meeting of the General Synod. The only district opposed to the continued support of the Hermannsburg Society was the Minnesota District. We are unable to see any entering into church fellowship with the German regional churches in the transfer of funds on our part to the Hermannsburg Missionary Society." Ohioans have long since lost the right understanding of what is right, God-pleasing church fellowship and what is reprobate, God-unpleasing church fellowship. F. B.

**Symbolic fidelity**. The German paper of the General Council ("Der Deutsche Lutheraner") writes: "There was a time in our church when the confessions were ignored and spoken of contemptuously. That time is generally past. Today it is another danger that threatens us: one accepts the Confessions outwardly, one praises them and professes them without knowing them rightly." That is weakly put. The fact is that there are many today who invoke the Lutheran symbols and then wipe their mouths and teach the opposite of what they have invoked. True faithfulness to the symbols consists not merely in the formal acceptance of the symbols, but also in really holding fast to the individual teachings of the symbols, even materially, and heartily rejecting all contrary teachings. The formal acceptance of the symbols has lost much of its meaning nowadays. If one wishes to ascertain the position of the individual, one is compelled to go into the individual teachings themselves. The false teachers know how to impute a false meaning to the clear words of Scripture, as well as to the explanations of the symbols. How little the formal acceptance of the symbols really guarantees a right position in all parts of doctrine, has been proved in America not only by the General Synod, the Iowa and Ohio Synods, but also by the Council. Just as there are people who call themselves Lutherans and yet are not Lutherans, so there are pastors who formally profess the symbols without error and yet deny the doctrines of the symbols. That there are Lutherans who are not Lutheran was expressed the other day by the ***Lutheran,*** without even saying it.

intentional. The "German Lutheran" writes on page 18: "***The Lutheran,*** our twin brother ('twin brother' does not actually cover the relationship, we are 'Unitarians', like the two Siamese), has extended to us a quite friendly and well-meant greeting of welcome. In his affectionate enthusiasm, of course, something happened to him that excited our laughing muscles: he called our paper 'The German Lutheran Lutheran': 'The German Lutheran.' That is a little too much of a good thing and reminds us of the German Hungarian who called us 'Mr. Herr von Pastor Reverend'. No, we want to be good Lutherans, certainly; but not double-distilled!" If the "German Lutheran" really wants to be a Lutheran Lutheran, he must resolutely stand up not merely for a correct formal confession of the symbols, but also for the individual doctrines of the same; nor must he shirk in the doctrinal disputes which have agitated our church for fifty years, but he must take the right, firm stand and reject every false doctrine, and also in practice he must bring the Lutheran confession to full fruition, and all this in a way which has not hitherto been done by the sheets in the General Council. Fr. Ruccius writes in "Deutscher Lutheraner" p. 19: "It is a beautiful name with which the paper goes out into the wide world, and we can give it no better wish on its way than that 'Der Deutsche Lutheraner' may always show itself worthy of its name. Let the word of the apostle Fakobus (5:12) apply to him: 'But let your word be, Yes, which is yes, and No, which is no, lest ye fall into hypocrisy.' To the yes of faith must come the no against unbelief and misbelief. So Luther did when he said at Worms: 'Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me!' Not only to say yes to the pure doctrine of the Word of God, but also to dare to say no to all false doctrine, that is the Lutheran way. It may not please many, but for that very reason it is all the more necessary in a time of unionism, when people cry, "Peace, peace! and yet there is no peace, since false doctrine is to have the same right as true doctrine, since yes and no are to apply at the same time. History, however, teaches us that the Church, as often as she became timid of struggle, experienced a period of decline." Hereby Fr. Ruccius has named that which is especially necessary to the leaves in the General Council: decisiveness.

F. B.

**From the Roman Church.** 1. Of the church membership, the Roman Church in New Mexico is 88 per cent, in Rhode Island 74, Montana 73, Massachusetts 69, Nevada 66, Arizona 66, New York 63, New Hampshire 63, Louisiana 61, Connecticut 59, California 58, Vermont 55, Maine 53, New Jersey 51, Wisconsin and Michigan a little over 50 per cent. 2. According to Joseph McCabe, the Roman Church has lost 80,000,000 adherents in the last 50 years, of which 2,000,000 are in England and 17,500,000 throughout the English-speaking world. As for the Romanists, they soon boast of their growth, and soon lament their great losses. 3. Rev. O'Connor, a former priest, is said to have won no less than 130 priests and 10,000 laity from the Papal Church by his mission in New York and by his paper, ***The Converted Catholic.*** 4) The Roman Monitor of San Francisco laments the spread of Protestantism in the Philippines, as well as the lack of priests and money to protect the Pope's interests there. 5. in the

The Socialist candidate won in the strongest Catholic **ward in** Milwaukee, although his opponent was a Catholic. The ***Independent*** asks, "Are these 'Catholic' Socialists counted as Catholics in the census which gives the Roman Church 14,000,000 members?" 6. The Papists are also seeking to gain influence over the **Laymen's Missionary Movement.** The ***Catholic Union and Times***, referring to the same, says: "**There are scores of good works in which Catholic and non-Catholic may join for betterment of the entire community. True religion does not produce hate, but love**." But that the Roman religion is a false one is evident from the fact that the papacy is everywhere sowing hatred and discord. Rockefeller's recent humanitarian foundations have prompted the Pope to give him his blessing. The Pope explained that although Rockefeller was a Protestant, he blessed him because everyone who does good deserves God's blessing. How greedily the Pope's eyes peer for the millions of this Protestant! The Roman paper ***Extension*** complains: "**There has never been an even ordinarily noticeable legacy from a wealthy Catholic to the cause of Catholic missions.**" Archbishop Glennon also complained bitterly some weeks ago about the lack of generosity, especially among rich Catholics. The doctrine of works and indulgences does lead to legacy creep, begging, **raffles** and other impure means to get money into the pockets of the priests, but it does not produce Christian generosity. In New Orleans, this stronghold of the Antichrist in America, Protestant women are now allowed to attend all **wards in** the **Louisiana Charity Hospital,** which was previously only allowed to nuns. Also, after many futile attempts, the city council has finally allowed the Presbyterians to build their own hospital. 10. In Boston, the library of millionaire Hollingsworth was sold at auction, the "Nuremberg Chronicle" of A. Koberger 1493 bringing $230.00. The advertisement of this book read, "**This copy contains the cut of 'Joannes Septimus,' *i. e.*, Pope Joan and her baby, which is generally either destroyed by cutting out or by erasure**." 11 The Bishop of La Crosse, Wis. announced that he would not grant a dispensation to bless mixed marriages unless the non-Catholic part had first been instructed in Roman doctrine. The result was that in 25 cases out of 30 the Protestant part became Catholic. Other bishops have now made the same order.' 12. A Papist church in Cleveland has received from Cologne a bone from the arm of St. Ursula. Processions and lighted candles were then held to venerate this bone, which may be a 'dog's or horse's bone.' 13. The late D. Lea, in his book "**Celibacy,**" says that three-fourths of all the priests in South America live with concubines or otherwise lead a lewd life. As long as Lea lived, the papists did not stir against his book. Now, however, papist papers are lying: Lea has declared that his statements were taken from newspapers which he no longer knows how to name. What Lea says, however, is confirmed by E. Curtis in his book "**The Capitals of South America**", although in his history he favors the Romans wherever he can. Quite a few years ago, the Paulist fathers in New Orleans also claimed that Gladstone had retracted and repudiated everything he wrote against the Papacy. But Gladstone's son declared, "**My father never retracted anything said in the 'Vatican Decrees' or 'Vaticanism**.'" 14. the sectarian abuses known-

their churches for entertainments. This prompts the "Orphan Friend of Ohio" to the following self-praise: "We Catholics would not dare to permit ourselves to do such a thing in distant churches, because we have real houses of worship, where the all-good and all-powerful God is really present." But the fact is, that by nothing is a house so profaned and desecrated as by the heresies of the Papists, and the abomination of their mass. 15. Archbishop O'Connell of Boston has declared himself against the cures of the Eddyists and Emanuelites. Of the fraud, however, which the Romanists practise with their miracles of the saints, the archbishop says nothing. And yet against this fraud the quackery of the censured sects is as a drop in the bucket. 16. ***The Morning Star of*** New Orleans, in its number of May 15, 1909, said, "**Our advice to those who may have been innocently trapped into spending their good money for what they thought was an authorized Bible is to place these books into a stove or furnace where they can be used for kindling material.**" Later, when this papist paper was accused of advising the burning of the Bible, it called this allegation "**a willful, malicious, and monstrous lie." Audacter ca- lumna! Audacter nega**! This is the double maxim of the Romanists. 17. Christian marriage has been profaned by none so much as by the Pope and his celibate priests. And yet the arch hypocrite Gibbons has again played himself out in ***Century Magazine*** as the patron saint of marriage and its

Holiness! In Chicago the other day, the priest Kearns exhorted his faithful: "**It is every man's duty to marry and raise a family. Married men live longer and are happier than those who remain single**." With this, however, Kearns pronounced judgment on himself and condemned celibacy as unnatural. 19 Under the name of Columbus Day, October 12 is now observed as a legal holiday in New York, Massachusetts, and Kentucky. Generally this is regarded as a success of the political agitation of the **Knights of Columbus,** and as an un-American concession of the State to the Papist sect. 20, In the Ohio State Legislature, the **Knights of Columbus** filed a bill to obtain state funds for the Papist **St. Anthony's Orphanage**. 21, In Montreal the Papists demanded 850,000 from the city to hold their "Eucharistic Conference," but the Protestants vigorously protested against this. In the city of New York the Romans opened eleven new schools last year with room for 10,000 children, and in all they have 166 schools there with 120,000 children, for which they persistently demand state funds. The Roman paper, ***The Tidings,*** of Los Angeles, says that the Catholic Church, through its schools, saves the United States $203,369,690 annually, and that this sum is therefore owed by the State to the Church. "**Let our children be examined by a state board, and if we furnish the goods, let the State put down the cash**." State money for Catholic schools: that is the Romanists' ca**eterum censeo.** And if the state were to agree to this, a new demand would soon follow: Compensation for past expenditures on these schools. 23. At the meeting of the **American Federation of Catholic Societies** in Pittsburg, Feeney said, "**We want your help in securing state aid to recompense Catholics for providing a secular education for their children in parochial schools.**" 24. whither the striving of the Rom-

The fact that the Catholic Church is not a Catholic Church is also shown by the pronouncement of Bishop McFaul in New Jersey: "We American Catholics are shamefully neglecting two things: the support of the Catholic press and of higher Catholic education." Our country hopes to bring the Roman hierarchy under its sway through the press, and still more through Papist school education, which is essentially nothing more than "illumination to a cadaverous obedience to the brilliant and powerful institution at whose head stands the **pontifex maximus.**" 26 At the dedication of **Loyola Academy** in Chicago, Archbishop Quigley said: through their schools, Catholics would eventually dominate our country, socially, commercially, and politically. "**I look forward to the time when the Catholic laity will govern the political and the home world, because it is the laity that composes the strength of the Church. And this time is coming surely, especially in this country, where the church foundations are more firm than those of kings, because founded on the devotion of the people**." All non-Catholic schools were simply labeled atheistic by Quigley. 26 ***The Morning Star of*** New Orleans called on all Catholics in the world to organize under the leadership of bishops and priests to stand united for the power and spread of the papacy. In Baltimore in 1889, Ireland declared, "**Our work is to make America Catholic. Our cry shall be, 'God wills it!' and our hearts shall leap with crusader enthusiasm**!" 27. The ***New York Times*** Of March 31 reported, "**That it was their duty to make this city go down in history as 'the Rome of the New World,' was the message of Archbishop Farley to the 200 Catholics at the annual dinner of the Xavier Alumni Sodality last night at the Hotel Astor.**" The Bostonian writes: "The good Mother Church first speaks gently and kindly; then she warns gravely and anxiously; but finally she declares with a fixed gaze to the defiant child, "You must!" This is also true with regard to the ***Pilot, which*** every Catholic in the diocese must read. 29. In Chile, according to ***World-Wide Missions,*** a priest in a speech warned his faithful against arguing with Protestants thus: "**Hit the comer on the head with the 'tranka' [beam for closing door at night], for that is the only effective way of arguing with a Protestant.**" 30 The death of H. C. Lea last year caused the papist-inclined ***Mirror of*** St. Louis to remark: Lea had not taken into account in his history of the Spanish Inquisition "**the accessible evidence for the *defense to* be found in the libraries of Europe**". So he too seems to want to justify the Spanish Inquisition. We are reminded by the ***Mirror of*** the coarser pronouncement of the ***Western Watchman of*** December 24, 1908: the Protestants in France and Spain had been persecuted with the full approval of the Church. "**We have always defended the persecution of the Huguenots and the Spanish Inquisition." "When she thinks it good to use physical force, the Church will use it." "She gives no bonds that such things (persecutions) shall not occur again**." From 1481 to 1808, the Inquisition in Spain burned alive 34,656 and in effigy 18,049, condemned to galley service 288,214, and tortured to death countless victims in prisons. According to the ***Western Watchman,*** therefore, Rome would be ready, if need be, to repeat these abominations. 31 The Papists teach, "No man hath any right in the sight of God to believe and teach what is false." This is true. But if they conclude from this:

"So people must be made to accept the truth, the pope's doctrine, by all means, including coercion," this is false, doubly false. For not even to the right faith may anyone be forced, much less to a false, godless faith, such as the papacy teaches. F. B.

**American Audiences with the Pope.** Like Fairbanks and Roosevelt, Paret, the bishop of the Episcopal Church in Baltimore, has now been denied an audience with the Pope, despite his recommendations from Gibbons, Merry del Val declaring: "The Holy Father is neither an image to be admired nor a statue to be criticized." With this, del Val admits that many only want to see the Pope, who still allows his toe to be kissed, as they would otherwise see a **freak** in the circus or a curiosity from the Middle Ages. The Pope himself is well aware of this, but he hopes to make capital out of the circus, and he really does, by the mere fact that he makes everyone understand that he sees a quasi-recognition in the request for an audience and expects and, under certain circumstances, demands corresponding behavior. The fact remains that the basic error lies in the fact that Roosevelt and Fairbanks sought an audience with the Pope in the first place. Roosevelt, referring to the audience with the Pope, stated: "**He felt that he had acted in the only way possible for an American to act**. In other words, American liberty does not mix well with the papacy. Nevertheless, Roosevelt continues to flatter the Pope as a "holy father" and "head of a great church" to whom it would have given him great honor and pleasure to be introduced. 3. That there are still Catholic citizens in our country who reject the Pope's insolence is evident from the following letter by a Catholic in the ***New York Times: "I personally feel that any other action Colonel Roosevelt might have taken would have resulted in the humiliation not only of himself but of the American people, Catholic as well as Protestant, and would have established an unwise precedent of serious consequences in the future***. The ***Catholic World,*** however, judges differently, regretting very much that Roosevelt had caused the Holy Father so much pain and annoyance and had not used the opportunity "to hear words of love for America and her people from the lips of the great regent of Christendom. After all, Pius X, referring to America, also declared: "If there is a country on earth that I wish to see, it is America. For from all that I have heard from the bishops, from priests and laymen, I am inclined to think that it is the land of the future, especially for the Church." America, the land of the future for the Papacy, politically bankrupt in Europe! The plan of the papists was to make great capital out of the Roosevelt audience for their Church. When they failed to do so, they sought to hold themselves harmless by bitter attacks on the Methodists and all sorts of tales about Roosevelt's papist sentiments. Roosevelt, the papists wrote, had declared that once he returned to the United States he would see to the expulsion of the Methodists from Rome. Even Roosevelt felt compelled to call this rumor "**unqualified falsehood.**" Furthermore, Roosevelt is said to have shown a Franciscan friar in Italy a medal of St. Joseph with the words, "**I carried**

**this during my entire African trip**." According to this, Roosevelt, at least. under his shirt, already a true pope. Of Edward VII, too, the rumor was spread immediately after his death that he had died a pope. The grain of truth in such lies is: from seduction by the Pope even a man like Roosevelt is safe only so long as he hates, really hates, antichristianity in the papacy. **Impleat vos Deus odio papae**! Only where God answers this prayer is there safety from Roman seduction. Whoever gives the pope the finger, he soon has him whole; whoever flirts with him, he is under his spell. 6 In connection with his "**Bigotry Letter,**" Roosevelt said: if there were any tension between the United States or its institutions and the Vatican, the Romans in this country would stand loyal to the United States and against the Vatican. In the case of some lay Catholics, this may be true. After all, in the audience affair, they did not call Roosevelt but Merry del Val a scapegoat and condemned him. But is Roosevelt really so naive as to believe that the hierarchy will ever give itself up to take a stand for our country against the Pope and Merry del Val? In Washington, Father Hannon publicly declared, that is, at any rate with the approval of his superior, Cardinal Gibbons: "**The Catholics of America have little use for a 'man on the fence,' and although he (Roosevelt) was the first Republican President who polled the great Catholic vote of America, he will find that he can expect little from the Catholics in the future.**" **Rule or ruin**, according to which the hierarchy in the United States will also be guided. If Roosevelt had agreed to have the Pope revise his itinerary, the Pope would certainly not only have removed the Methodists from his list. According to the news, Roosevelt received a delegation of Freemasons in Rome and had them give him a special degree! He also dined in Italy (quite apart from his conduct in Paris) with Fogazzaro, the Modernist whose works the Pope has placed on the Index, and also with Nathan, the city mayor, who is a Jew, a Mason, a Socialist, and an anticlerical. If Roosevelt had said A with reference to the Methodists, he should have said B here also. 8. In May of last year the Papist Church in the United States passed from the missionary stage to the canonical basis, and since then it has been considered a regular church. But with that, he says, the onus is now on Catholics to openly advocate for state recognition. Thus Gonzalez judges, "**The Catholic Church in America now stands openly, in theory, to a policy of political interference.**" From this, Gonzalez thinks, the Vatican's position on Roosevelt can be explained: open recognition of the Pope and submission of the state to his chair, that is now also the slogan of the Catholic Church in America. 9. Roosevelt and Taft claim: a good Catholic is also a good American citizen every time. But this is at best a sophistical judgment, for a "good Catholic" can mean a good, honest man who adheres to the Catholic Church, but also a man to whom the essence of the papacy, Jesuitism, has passed into **succum et sanguinem,** and who, as a consistent papist, is therefore a man dangerous to the state. Whether, after the experiences he has had in Rome, this has now also become clear to Wohl Roosevelt?

F. B.

**Rome and the Methodists.** For the defeat of the pope by Fairbanks and Roosevelt, the papists are taking revenge on the Methodists by reviling them, especially in our country, for their alleged invective and proselytizing in Rome. But when Jreland and comrades were called upon to specify and prove their complaints, they simply repeated their **generalia**, and inveighed louder about **pernicious proselyters and diabolical campaign** against "the church of Christ in Rome." In particular, the Romanists resent the following statement printed by the Methodists in Rome: "**Popery is the great enemy of Christ, the most barefaced and abominable negation of the principles and morals of the Gospel.**" Even many Methodists, who do not yet realize the full abomination of antichristianity, have taken great offense at the above words. The Romanists are also incensed at the fact that the Methodists supply such Italians as avail themselves of their bodily help with literature against the Papacy at the same time. This, says Archbishop Glennon, is a criminal offence and to be punished by the authorities. Basically, then, it is freedom of religion and speech in Rome that the papists in America are bitter about. 2) To combat the work of the Methodists in Rome, the Papists have formed a special society, which uses every means to deprive people who hold to the Methodists of bread, friendship, domestic peace, and conjugal communion. The same complaints come from Spain and other countries, where papists make the most extensive use of boycotts against those who convert to Protestants. And the attitude in which the Romans in America look upon the apostates is evident from the words of Phelan, who, according to the "A. C." in the ***Western Watchman,*** thus wrote: "**The man who apostatizes from the Catholic Church is an unmitigated scoundrel, a renegade to every honest and honorable principle. . . . We would rather see a relation of ours hanged than a renegade from his religion**." (3) Concerning the proselytizing, the Paulist fathers in our country have been brought to the attention of the Romanists from all sides, who are **ex professo bent on** capturing Protestants for papism. Last year 74 fathers were active, who in 15,000 meetings claim to have "converted" 28,000 Protestants, in Detroit alone about 300. The ***New York Christian Advocate*** therefore writes: if the Romanists ask for a comparison between the Methodists and Papists with regard to morals and methods, **they** should only go ahead, "**but they must be prepared for expositions of a kind and extent and a certainty which will make them wish they had never challenged the comparison: in fact, in the end it will not be a comparison but a contrast**! 4. Of the dirty fighting methods of the Romans in the Fairbanks-Roosevelt affair, the ***Central Christian Advocate*** wrote***:*** "**We were interested to see that their (papists') methods of defense in America are exactly the same as in Italy and France, that is, they throw mud, and they are the most unscrupulous mud-throwers in the world.**" Rome seeks to smother its opponents in a flood of toxic ink. And against no one have the Romanists foamed out so many blasphemies and lies as against Luther, even in America. At the end of last year, for example, **Father Foley** claimed at the Eucharistic Convention in Springfield, in the ***Record*** there, and in his own paper, that Luther had "destroyed the

He said that the Mass had been cancelled as a result of an audience with the devil, and that Luther taught that one could quite well and confidently remain a vicious servant and yet become righteous and blessed through faith, etc. And **Father Foley** is only one of many. The "A. C." writes: "**In another column of the *New York Globe* they (Romanists) stated that Henry VIII, Calvin, Luther, and Knox were a quartet of polygamists and murderers. Luther had many wives, and Knox murdered Mary, Queen of Scots, and slew the husbands of others.**" 5. The Methodist paper in Rome, ***Cenni Storici,*** says that in Rome Methodism has a splendid opportunity of learning the evil arts and deceits, the terrible power of seduction, and the lying wonders of the great enemy of Christ. Let the Papacy be no mere inferior form of Christianity, but a manifest and abominable negation of the Gospel. - We are reminded of the words of the founder of the Catholic University in Washington, Miss Mary Caldwell, who resigned from the Papacy in 1904, declaring: "**Since I have been living in Europe my eyes have been opened to what that church really is, and to its anything but sanctity.**" 6. But the Papist ***Pilot of*** Boston claims: "**Catholicism is the same here as in other parts of the world, and we make no apology for it here or elsewhere**. And the ***pilot*** is also right in two respects. First, if Catholicism is spiritually, morally, etc., higher in Germany, England, and the United States than it is in Spain, Italy, Portugal, and other stock Catholic countries, the reason for this lies not in Catholicism but in the Protestant environment and thus in a non-Catholic influence. Then, indeed, all true papists, the most ignorant as well as the most educated, the most immoral as well as the most moral, agree in the pagan doctrine of salvation by one's own works and penances. ***The National Protestant Standard of*** England writes: "**If Mr. Roosevelt had gambled at Monaco or Monte Carlo, owned the 'tenderloin' quarters in New York, or frequented the haunts of vice in Brussels or Ostend, it might be overlooked, and an audience granted, but the line must be drawn at a possible attendance at a Methodist church**." As soon as the Pope perceives that any one has recognized him for what he really is, his hatred is an irreconcilable one, and then he answers **sanguine** rather than **atramento**.

F. B.

## II. Abroad.

**Lack of fear of the Word of Scripture**. "This was the error already in the Lutheran revival in the middle of the last century. It is true that people had awakened from coarse rationalism and had learned to appreciate the Lutheran church, its confession, its songs, its edification books and agendas again and had drawn them to the light, but a simple conversion to God's Word and Luther's teaching was rejected by most especially among the leaders. In part, they thought that they had to bring theology into a system as a science and to derive all other truths from one basic truth, and thus unawares conceded lordly rights to the handmaid - to reason - and made her master of God's Word, thus deviating from true wisdom, the source of which is the fear of God and unconditional submission to God's Word. Partly they overestimated the

The scientific community, in spite of the undoubted and in many respects valuable progress made in historical research, readily applied to the Bible the principles of historical research which are justified in human writings, forgetting the true fear of God, and regarding the Bible more and more as a collection of documents concerning God's revelations, instead of seeing in it the revelation and the Word of God Himself. In this way, the longer one respected the representatives of science who were hostile to the Bible and to God, the more respect was shown for them, a greater respect than for the Word of God, and thus slid downward on the slippery slope once trodden, so that some representatives of positive theology differ little more from those of liberal theology, who see in the Bible a mere book of men and in our Lord Jesus a mere man

.

**Monasticism in Spain**. The "Rheinisch-Westfäl. Wochenblatt": "The destruction of numerous monasteries and the gruesome murder of many monks and nuns appear at first glance as an inexplicable mystery. But the monasteries, which had become factories, had become a national calamity, formally challenged the workers, who had become unemployed, to help themselves. Trade and industry associations repeatedly addressed very energetic petitions to the government demanding relief. In one such petition we read: 'Spain has turned into an enormous monastery. The non-tax-paying religious orders are building schools, liqueur factories, perfume shops, printing works, bookbinderies, linen confections, soap factories, shoe factories, and are taking over all kinds of manual labour to the detriment of the worker, the industrialist and the merchant/ The attention of the Spanish government has repeatedly been drawn to the excessive exploitation of the labour of the young people and children housed in convents. And what do the convents trade in? Pretty much anything that makes money. Let's look at a monastic business prospectus, it's the 125th of the Monastery of the 'Holy Trinity' in Madrid. There one finds, among other things, offers with the following designations: Sowing of Money - Oath before God - Commodities - Bread of St. Anthony - Way to Perfection - Gifts - Penitentials - Novelties - Chocolates - Attainment of Eternal Bliss - Occasional Purchase -. In the midst of worldly things figure 'instruments of penance': wire shirts, wire belts, pieces of wire back, chains, Spanish and French, coiled and curled scourges in leather and iron, knotted belts; all these beautiful things, destined to mortify the sinful body, are described as specialities, scarcely obtainable elsewhere. These gruesome articles of commerce are followed in the monastic price list by: Stockings, corsets, petticoats, waistcoats, suits for men and children, etc., all elegant and at the cheapest prices. Then books, statues, flags, 'practical souvenir sheets, greatest novelties, extremely useful for the deceased and the living." 'Mother of God of Lourdes' and -immaculate Madonna' at ten pesetas cheaper than usual. Attached is a warning: 'We hereby inform you that we have no outside defeats for our works, and that the firm "The Trinity"" has no relation whatsoever to our monastery. Do not be deceived." "
R. K.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 58. July 1910. No. 7.**

## Did Luther mutilate the Bible?

"Luther mutilated the Bible!" "**Luther mutilated the Bible**!" Such is the accusation which the Romanists, especially since the establishment of the papal "Bible Commission," have again raised with great indignation in their writings for the people. They present the matter to the people as if the Apocrypha had always been universally recognized throughout Christendom as canonical books, and as if, until Luther's time, the Latin Vulgate had been universally regarded as authentic throughout the Church. It was only Luther who, with a nefarious hand, attacked the canonicity of those books in order to get rid of their inconvenient proofs, and humanistic interests induced him to deny the authenticity of the old venerable Vulgate. In this point, too, Luther had opposed the entire church of antiquity and renounced it,

"Luther has mutilated the Bible!" so cry the papists. "Really the legates - at the Council of Trent - had succeeded in the winter of 1546 in canonizing the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and in making the Latin church translation, instead of the basic text, the norm of faith," wrote Dr. E. Preuß, known as a thorough connoisseur of church history, before he became a Papist. (Uninfl. Empfängn., p. 73.) Now who is right? Let us ask the sheets of the history of the Tridentine Council.

On December 3 and 4, 1563, the Council held its last session, the 25th. On December 3, the Venetian Jesuit Jerome Ragazoni, Bishop of Nazianzus, delivered the bombastic "Final Address," which began with the sweeping words: "Hear it, all peoples; hear it, all you who inhabit the world!" Among the things which all the inhabitants of the world should HEAR, Loyola's eloquent disciple also mentions this: "At the very beginning, this holy council of the Church, ... in order to lay a foundation, as it were, for his future actions and to show what kind of testimonies and safeguards should be relied upon in establishing the doctrines of the faith,

the books of the Old and New Covenants, which are to be accepted without any doubt, faithfully and wisely enumerated according to the example of the most approved ancient councils, and, lest any difficulty should arise even about the words of the different translations, approved a reliable and definite translation from the Greek and Hebrew." (Smets, p. 202.)

If one compares what the Jesuit says here with the decisions taken by the Council in this matter, one is immediately struck by how cleverly this devious Venetian has twisted the truth. Judging from his speech, the Council would have done absolutely nothing else than what the "most approved ancient Councils" had also done, namely, only this, that it had enumerated "the books of the Old and New Covenants, which are to be accepted without all doubt," whereas it is historical fact, that the Council of Trent did something which never occurred to any ancient Council, namely, this, that it canonized the apocryphal books of the Old Testament by solemn resolution, and inflicted the curse of excommunication on any one who refused to accept them as such. And further, the Council did not merely "approve" the Latin translation of the Bible, but declared it "authentic" and commanded that it be used in all public lectures, disputations, sermons, and interpretations. This had never occurred to any council before.

But even then, if one takes Ragazoni's words as they read, the Council's conduct must seem strange. The Council had been convened primarily as a result of repeated urging on the part of Luther and the German imperial estates, and above all for the purpose of settling the division that had broken out in religious matters. The Protestants, however, had declared again and again that this could only be done in such a way that the Holy Scriptures alone would be recognized as the arbiter at the council, and not, as had hitherto been the case, tradition or council decisions, least of all the pronouncements of the popes. It was known to the Council that the Lutherans did not recognize the Apocrypha as a canonical book, that they absolutely rejected tradition as a source of doctrine, and that the Scriptures in Luther's German translation had already been distributed among the people in innumerable copies. And that the Lutherans recognized neither the Vulgate nor the text of any translation as authentic, that had already been learned enough to his sorrow. If, therefore, there was one question which, above all others, should first have been the subject of detailed deliberation and discussion at the Council, it was certainly none other than that of the Holy Scriptures. For as long as there was no agreement on the question of the source of knowledge, the deliberations on all the other articles were bound to remain fruitless.

In view of this fact, one is involuntarily led to ask: What was the purpose of whipping through this so important matter with such haste now that hardly a handful of "Fathers" were assembled, and among them hardly a representative of Germany? The Jesuit, who seems to have slept here once, tells us himself what the purpose was when he says in his speech that these resolutions were passed at the very beginning because the Council first wanted to "lay a foundation stone for its future actions." It had first to forge for itself the weapons with which it wished to combat the closed doctrinal unity of the Augsburg relatives of religion. The history of the Council shows this quite clearly.

The fourth session, at which only 5 cardinals, 19 archbishops and 42 bishops were present, was held on April 18, 1546. In preparation for the same, a number of allegedly heretical sentences about the Holy Scriptures had been collected from Luther's writings, which were then discussed in detail in several congregations 1). According to Sarpi, the contents of these propositions were as follows: 1. That the articles of Christian doctrine necessary to salvation are all contained in the Holy Scriptures; that it is a human invention to set by their side the unwritten tradition as such, bequeathed to the Church by JESUS CHRIST and his apostles, and brought down to us by an unbroken series and succession of bishops; and that it is a sacrilege to make their authority equal to the authority of the Old and New Testaments; 2. That among the canonical books of the Old Testament only those may be numbered which have been recognized as such by the Jews, and that from the canon of the New Testament the epistle to the Hebrews, which bears the name of Paul, the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, the second and third epistles of John, likewise the epistle of Jude, and the revelation of John, must be excluded. 3. That, if one wished to learn the true understanding of the Holy Scriptures, and to adduce the own words of holy men, one must have recourse to the fundamental text in which they were actually written, and reject the Latin translation as being full of errors and mistakes; 4. That the Holy Scriptures are easy and clear, and that, in order to understand them, one needs neither glosses nor extensive notes, but only the instructing spirit of JESUS CHRIST. (Sarpi, History of the Trid. Conc. Edited by F. E. Rambach. Book 2, Section 1, § 51.)

1) The Council worked in such a way that the bishops, theologians and canonists present were divided into three so-called congregations, to which the individual matters were referred for preliminary deliberation. These particular Congregations then reported to the General Congregation, where the decisions were made. These decisions were then solemnly proclaimed in public session of the Council.

- The Congregation was also charged with deliberating whether or not to publish canons with the usual curses against these Lutheran errors.

Among the aforementioned sentences, it was especially the second and third that occupied the "Fathers" in those preliminary deliberations. From the history of the Council we learn that the meetings of this preliminary congregation were very heated. There was a tremendous clash of spirits. History and linguistics seriously wrestled with stupidity and falsehood, but in vain. The papal legates achieved their purpose, as the two decrees of the fourth session clearly show. In the decree "of the canonical writings," namely, the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and two of the Maccabees are included "as such as have been derived either orally by Christ or from inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and have been retained in constant succession in the Catholic Church." Then follows the usual curse of excommunication, "But if any man shall not hold these books whole, with all their parts .... ...as sacred and canonical, ...let him be excommunicated." And in the decree, "On the Edition and Use of the Sacred Books," it says: "The same Most Holy Council of the Church . . . decrees and declares that this very old and vulgar edition ... shall be considered authentic in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and interpretations, and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it on whatever pretext."

It might seem that this was the expression of the unanimous conviction of all the "Council Fathers". But the history of the preliminary deliberations teaches us otherwise. All were pretty much agreed that a catalogue of the sacred books should be drawn up, and that all the books usually read in the Roman Church should be mentioned in it. In this also most agreed that the Old Testament canon should not be limited to those books which had been accepted by the Jews. The catalogues of the Council of Laodicea, of Pope Gelasius, of Pope Innocent I, of the third Council of Carthage, were suggested as models. But when the form of the catalogue was to be determined, the dance began. Four different plans were put forward and advocated with great vehemence by their representatives. One proposed that all the biblical books should be enumerated in two divisions. The one should contain only those books which had always been accepted as canonical without any contradiction, the Homologumena of Eusebius; but in the other should be named those books which had been rejected by some, and about whose authenticity there was more or less doubt: the Antilegomena. It is true that this distinction was never expressly pronounced by a pope or by a council, but **de facto** it was

but tacitly recognized in the Church. Augustine made this distinction, and in the canon "**In Canonicis**" Augustine's authority on this point was confirmed. Gregory, who lived after Gelasius, also declared in his interpretation of the Book of Job that the books of the Maccabees were written for edification and were also quite useful to read, but they were not canonical. Aloysius of Catanea, a Dominican friar, certainly declared that Jerome had already made this very distinction, and that the Church had adopted it as the rule for determining the biblical canon. He also referred to Cardinal Cajetan, who followed Augustine in this and made the same distinction. In the dedication to Clement VII of his treatise on the historical books of the Old Testament, Cajetan declared that this distinction was an established principle of the Church. The second plan was to divide the biblical books into three classes. In the first, those books were to be named which had always been accepted as divine without any contradiction. In the second, those should be listed about which there had been some doubt at some time, but which in the course of time had acquired canonical standing in the Church, namely, several passages in the Gospels, a number of epistles, and the Revelation. In the third section would be the books of the Old Testament which were never considered canonical, namely the seven Apocrypha, and the passages in Daniel and the Book of Esther which were not written in Hebrew. The third proposal was that no distinction at all should be made between the biblical books, but that, following the procedure of the Council of Carthage and other synods, the catalogue should simply be presented without any remarks. According to the fourth plan, it was to be declared that all the books, in all their parts, just as they stood in the Latin. Vulgate, were of equal divine authority. But here the Book of Baruch caused considerable difficulties, since it is not mentioned in the catalogues of the Councils of Laodicea and Carthage, nor in those of the various Popes. And since, according to all appearances, the beginning of the book is also missing, some thought that, for these reasons, one should at least refrain from this book. But the "Fathers" were not deterred by such trifles. It was badly asserted that, since lessons were also read from this book in the Roman Church, it must in any case be canonical. And the fact that it was missing from the catalogues of the ancients could easily be explained by the fact that they might have listed it in the canon under the name of the prophet Jeremiah. That, at any rate, was a very short but convenient way out of the jam. **Sit pro ratione voluntas**!

On March 8, 1646, an extraordinary congregation was held, in which it was decided that the ecclesiastical tradition too should do the same thing.

authoritative prestige as the written Word of God. With regard to the form of the catalogue of the canonical books of Holy Scripture, very different views were again expressed among the theologians in this consultation. One was that the individual books need not be named at all; another, that the books should be divided into three classes; the third, that all the books of the Latin Vulgate should be placed in a line as of equal divine authority. It was finally agreed to have three catalogues drawn up in accordance with these plans, which were then to be submitted to the next Congregation for consideration and decision. In the Congregation on March 15, 1546, these three catalogues were indeed presented, and their representatives gave them a lively endorsement. After a long heated debate, the third emerged as the victor, that is, the Apocrypha was canonized. So much, then, the papal legates had accomplished. Tradition had been made the Word of God, and the Apocrypha had been canonized. Now it was only a question of making the Latin church translation also the norm of faith instead of the basic text. Then the supports were ready with which to successfully reattach the tottering See of Peter; then one had the weapons with which to destroy the Augsburg heresy. And this work, too, was now at once assiduously set to work.

In the Congregation following March 15, the third proposition drawn from Luther's writings was the subject of deliberation. There was a fierce, often bitter struggle between the few who knew some Greek and some Latin, and the many who understood nothing of the former and very little of the latter. Now again it was especially the fiery Dominican Aloysius of Catanea who raised his voice loudly to save the Council from folly. With an effort of fine eloquence he recalled that Cardinal Cajetan, that world-famous theologian, whose learning had been so great that none of the "Fathers" need be ashamed to confess that he was a disciple of this man, had declared, after his meeting with Luther in 1523, that it would only be possible to heal the schism in the Church and to convince the heretics of their error if the Holy Scriptures were studied in the original languages with critical understanding. This excellent prelate often said that if one understood the Latin text, one did not understand the Word of God, which is infallible, but only the opinion of the translator, who could have been mistaken. Jerome rightly declared that prophesying and writing holy books was a divine work of the Holy Spirit, while translating a scripture from one language into another was a matter of purely human ability. Subsequently

Cajetan often sighed on the occasion of Jerome's words: "If God had willed that the teachers of past centuries had judged in the same way, the heresies of Luther would certainly not have found so easy a way in! Catanaeus further emphasized that neither the Vulgate nor any other translation of Scripture could be declared authentic without rejecting the canon "**Ut Veterum**" 2) which decrees that the truth of the Old Testament must be sought in the Hebrew and that of the New Testament in the original Greek text. For this purpose it would be a foolish undertaking to use a doubtful and not generally recognized text in the battle with the opponents, while one is in possession of the genuine, infallible text, by the use of which one can be sure of victory. With Jerome and Cajetan, one must admit that even the most careful and conscientious translator can make mistakes and errors. It would be quite another thing if the Holy Council itself were to undertake a translation. For then one could be sure that the Holy Spirit, who governs all councils in matters of faith, would protect the "Fathers" from oversights and errors through his assistance. A translation produced in this way could then, however, justifiably lay claim to authenticity. But since this work could hardly be done in ten years, it was in any case most advisable to leave things as they had been for 1500 years.

But the great majority of theologians were opposed to this view. They thought that the translation which had been so long accepted and used in the churches and schools must necessarily be held to be authentic, otherwise the Lutherans would have already won their cause, and doors and gates would be opened to endless heresies. The popes and the scholastic theologians, without exception, had based the doctrine of the Roman Church, which was after all the mother of all churches, on one or the other passage of the Vulgate. If, however, anyone were to be granted the right to question the correctness of this translation, the linguists and grammarians would throw everything into confusion and would finally raise themselves up as judges in matters of faith. But where would then remain the dignity and authority of the bishops and cardinals? And now even the inquisitors - how could they take vigorous action against the Lutherans if these heretics were allowed to shout at them at will: "That is not what the original text says! The translation is wrong!"? The end of the song would be that every grammar-school fox would pass off the ungodly outgrowths of his brain for the right doctrine, and prove it by means of a grammatical artifice from some arbitrary text. It is generally known that Luther's translation of the Bible has produced innumerable contradictory heresies, which

2) "Ut veterum librorum fides de Hebraeis voluminibus examinanda est, ita novorum veritas Graeci sermonis normam desiderat." (Decretis dist. 9.)

are all worthy of being consigned to eternal darkness. In addition, as is well known, Luther continually revised his own translation and never published a new edition of his Bible in which hundreds of texts had not been changed. If this unbridled freedom were to be allowed, then the time would soon come when no Christian would be able to know what he actually had to believe. God had given the Jewish Church an authentic Scripture and the Greek Church the authentic New Testament, and who would claim, without giving offence, that he had not shown the same great grace to the Roman Church, which he loved more than all others? It is not to be doubted that the same Holy Spirit who first gave these sacred books also guided the translation adopted by the Roman Church. - These remarks were heartily applauded by most. To others, however, it seemed very questionable that a man should be declared a prophet merely because he had translated a biblical book. They thought that one should rather take the middle course and say that the translators had not been inspired, but that the Holy Spirit had given them an assistance that was very similar to inspiration. But if one is not inclined to assume a special assistance of the Holy Spirit in the translation, one must at any rate admit that the Council enjoyed this assistance. Therefore, if the Council should now declare the Vulgate authentic and pronounce a curse on all who would dare to doubt its authenticity, it must be accepted as infallible, if not for the sake of the Spirit who guided the translation, then at any rate for the sake of the Spirit who had been given to the Council which had declared this translation authentic.

Isidore Clarius of Bresse, a learned Benedictine abbot, countered these arguments with history. He said something like: In the most ancient Church there were several translations of the Old Testament. They were collected into one book by Origen and placed side by side in six columns. This is the famous "Hexapla." The most important of these translations was the well-known Septuagint, from which several Latin translations were made. The New Testament was also often translated from the original Greek text into Latin. Of these Latin versions, the one that was read in the churches and preferred by Augustine to all others, the so-called "Itala", was the best known and most popular. But the original Greek text always took precedence, even over the Itala. When the great linguist Jerome recognized that this version of the Old Testament deviated in many passages from the basic Hebrew text, he decided to make a new translation directly from the Hebrew and at the same time, by careful comparison with the original Greek text, to improve the translation of the New Testament.

ments. The high reputation in which Jerome stood induced many to accept his version; others, however, rejected it, partly from dislike of innovation, partly from jealousy against Jerome. When, however, in the course of time this jealousy was somewhat consumed, Jerome's translation was pretty generally adopted and used alongside the Jtala. The Jtala was then called the old translation, and Jerome's version the new translation. St. Gregory may be called out as a witness to this. In his interpretation of the Book of Job, he writes to Leander that the Holy See makes use of both versions, although he prefers the 'new' one, since it most accurately reflects the sense of the Hebrew text. He therefore quotes sometimes according to the old, sometimes according to the new version, depending on what is most convenient for his purpose. - Thus theologians wavered for some time between the two versions, until at last both were combined and this compilation was given the name "Vulgate". Since the Psalms were sung daily in the churches, it did not seem advisable to change the text, and they were all included in the Vulgate in the old translation. The minor prophets are all in the Vulgate in the new translation, while the text of the major prophets is a compilation from both versions. There is certainly no doubt that all this was done according to God's will and ordinance; but therefore it cannot be said that more than mere human skill was required to do it. Jerome teaches quite freely and unabashedly that no translator is inspired by the Holy Spirit. But since the Latin translation now in use in the Roman Church is for the most part Jerome's translation, it would be audacity to attribute to him an inspiration which he himself emphatically asserts he did not have. From what has been said it follows irrefutably: a translation can never be considered equal to the original text, - In conclusion, Clarius thought that for these reasons the Vulgate was to be preferred to all other versions. It should be thoroughly revised and corrected according to the basic text and then declared authentic. If this were done, then the use of the other old translations would soon cease, and new translations could then be prevented by strict edicts.

Andrew Vega, a Franciscan friar, sought to mediate between the two extremes. He admitted that Jerome was right in denying prophetic inspiration to a translator. That too was undoubtedly correct when Jerome and Augustine demanded that every translation be examined and corrected according to the original text. But these considerations were not so important that the Church should allow itself to be prevented from declaring the Vulgate authentic. For by a decree to that effect she would be saying nothing more than that this version contains no substantial errors in the original text.

It is not the case, however, that it fully corresponds to the original in all expressions or even in the shades of meaning of individual words. A translation could never achieve such a degree of accuracy. The Vulgate has been in use in the Church for over a thousand years. In this long time it has been shown that it contains no essential errors with regard to doctrine and practice. The ancient councils had recognized it as sufficient, and this honor should not be robbed of it now. Rather, it should be declared authentic without hesitation, in the sense that everyone can confidently rely on its correctness without endangering his blessedness. Scholars should not be forbidden to study the original text. But the many new and erroneous translations, which only caused mischief and confusion in the church, should be vigorously suppressed.

Who all these proofs, objections, misgivings, contradictions, even protests, were not able to move the great majority of the "Fathers" to desist from their intention to declare the Vulgate the authentic Bible of the Church. The minority was beaten broadly, and it was decided that the Vulgate should be declared authentic, and then carefully perused and corrected. The text thus produced should then be considered **textus receptus** for all printed editions of the Bible. A commission of six members was immediately appointed to undertake this work and to carry it out as quickly as possible, so that the work could be published before the end of the Council.

In the Congregation of March 29, 1646, the wording of the decree on the Holy Scriptures was discussed. For some it seemed too harsh that a man should be excommunicated and cursed as a heretic doomed to eternal damnation, for no other reason than because he could not accept every word of the Vulgate as authentic and perhaps had a new opinion concerning the interpretation of this or that passage. But they were not heard. After much debate, it was decided to issue a decree declaring Tradition to be the Word of God and all the books contained in the Vulgate, including the Apocrypha, to be canonical. This decree was to be fastened with a solemn curse, anathema. The decision concerning the translation and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures was to be formulated in such words that all innovations and daring interpretations would be successfully resisted. But that this was not the expression of the unanimous conviction of all the "Fathers" is clear from the circumstance that at the close of the Congregation Cardinal Montanas, one of the three papal legates, after first giving them high praise because of their learning and prudence, earnestly and cordially admonished the "Fathers" that they should, if

The Council was to be held in the public session of the Council, in which, according to theory, discussions were still permitted, and these decrees were to be presented in an orderly and proper manner, carefully avoiding all disputation or even contradiction. For the dignity of the Council required that fine public decisions should have the character of unanimity and unanimity. How much, however, in spite of this paternal admonition, the legates were frightened by the feeling that in the end the storm might break out once more in the public session, is evident from the fact that after the close of the Congregation, Cardinal Cervini, the legate, invited all those who had opposed the canonization of the Apocrypha and the authorization of the Vulgate to a private conference, and tried to reassure them with the assurance that it was not forbidden, but rather permitted, to correct the Vulgate according to the basic text, and that basically nothing more was intended to be explained than that there were no errors in it that were of such importance that for their sake the whole version could or should be rejected. -- The porridge was thus cooked; all that was now lacking was that it should be presented to the Council in golden pompous bowls and be eaten most obediently by the "Fathers". And that, too, happened according to plan, to the great joy of the papal legates.

On 8 April 1546, the fourth public session of the Council was "celebrated". After Alepo, Archbishop of Sassari, had sung the Mass of the Holy Spirit and Aretinus, General of the Servite Order, had preached a sermon 3), the two decrees were read by the former.

And now came the vote. We have seen that, during the deliberations on this subject, there had been strong opposition in the Congregations to the content and the wording of the decrees which had been read. And consequently the presiding papal legates looked forward to the outcome of the vote with anxious suspense.

3) In this sermon also occurs the following description of faith: "Haec igitur vera, perfecta, viva atque Christiana fides habitus est in animo a Deo optimo maximo proficiscens, nunquam otiosus, sed in revelata omnia inclinans, nunquam non splendens pietatis operibus, caritatis speique perpetuus comes, radix et summa vitae sanctae, qui peccata non imputat, sed destruit, justitiam confert, pacem conscientiis donat, Deo placere facit, praestat haereditatem ut sit firma promissi, purificat corda, credentes servat, ne pudefiant, invocationem gignit cum fiducia, accipiendi petita, omnia possibilia reddit piis, parit confessionem justitiae, veras gratiarum actiones efficit, promissiones apprehendit, in adoptionem filiorum Dei mortales cooptat, eosque Christo ac Christum vicissim illis conjugit." Quoted from Massarelli's Actis Cone. Trid. in the 3rd part of Salig's Historie des Trid. Conc. - Only pity that the "Fathers" did not believe all this, but actually condemned it in the sixth session!

ness. But their fears proved groundless. The admonition of Montanus had been heeded and they behaved "properly and properly". Only two voices were raised against the decrees. And only one of the "fathers" dared to vote "no." This was the poor little recalcitrant Dominican, Jacob Nachianti, Bishop of Chioggia, who had declared earlier in the Congregation's deliberations that it would be "manifest impiety" to equate Tradition with Sacred Scripture. Cautiously, however, he added to his "**non placet**" the words: "**sed forsan obediam**," perhaps I will submit later.

So the prank had really succeeded. New fetters had been put on the spirits, and even the learned had a gag thrust into their mouths, which made even the slightest self-witness of Scripture impossible. Yea more, one had indeed an army of great witnesses of the ancient Church, men like Melito, Bishop of Sardis (170), Origen (200), Athanasius (330), Hilarius (350), Epiphanius (360), Gregory of Nazianzus (390), Amphilochus of Jconium (390), Jerome (400), Rufinus (400), not to mention Josephus and the Councils of Laodicea (367) and Chalcedon (451), all of whom deny the canonicity of the Apocrypha! Who then had done this? "**Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata**", "the most holy ecumenical and general Tridentine Church Council lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit". So, at least, the introduction to the above decrees instructs us. "Ecumenical" - from ***ἡ οικουμένη*** - means "pertaining to or representing the whole earth inhabited by men"; "general," that "which is common to all, which concerns all, in which all participate." An ecumenical general church assembly, then, is one at which the members of the church scattered over the whole world are represented by their representatives. This was indeed the case in the first centuries of the Christian Church. But since in the mouth of Rome "Christian Church" is synonymous with "Roman Church," the Tridentine "Fathers" probably meant to say that the Council represented the Roman Catholic Church of the whole world. Well, that must have been quite a vast, imposing assembly, to which one could have applied the poet's words, "Who counts the nations, names the names, that hospitably came together here?" But what a bitter disappointment is ours when we enter the Council Hall on April 8, 1546, in eager expectation! We had believed that we would behold a great assembly of eminent men from all parts of the world. But what do we see? There sit 5 cardinals, 19 archbishops and 42 bishops, almost all of them Italians. Our astonishment is even greater when we learn that a very large number of the bishops do not administer dioceses at all, that they are only titular bishops.

bishops, who therefore should and will represent no one but - Pope Paul III, whose creatures they are. We 'ask in amazement: Where are the pious Spaniards? Answer: They-- are not here yet, but are coming. Where are the beloved sons of France? Answer: They are not yet here either; they may not come at all. O wicked, ungrateful Francis II! Where are the English prelates? Answer: the poorest are not allowed to come, since the accursed Henry VIII - **Defensor Fidei** - made himself English Pope. Who would have thought it when he wrote so mightily against the arch-heretic Luther? O of the woe! Where are the conservative Germans, who have been crying themselves hoarse for a council for such a long time? Answer: Alas, not here either. The lumps are sitting up there in the inhospitable north, drinking communal beer, holding religious discussions and imperial days with the abominable heretics, and plotting against this most holy council. Well, well! - and this is what you call an ecumenical general council, such a handful of people? This wretched little group of Romans wants to teach and decide for the church of the whole world and consign to eternal damnation all those who do not agree with them? Answer: Why not? After all, His Excellency Cardinal Montanas has expressed the opinion that 20 synodal members are fully competent to decide in matters of doctrine for the universal Church! And now there are 66 of them here! Well, so be it! But what then of the famous canon of Vincentius Lerinensis, "**Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc est vere proprieque catholicum**"? Did the Council's deliberations and decisions on the question of the Holy Scriptures make any mention of it? The history of the Council proves just the contrary. It shows us: 1. That which the Council decided on this question, the ancient Church did not believe, but rejected; 2. Nor did many of the "Council Fathers" believe it, but only ducked **propter panem**. So they threw good Lerinus, together with his venerable canon, to the old iron. And that was good Catholic. For in one of the documents issued by the "dogmatic commission" of the Vatican Council in 1870, the Jesuits declared quite coolly that the canon of Vincentius Lerinensis had fooled Christendom long enough, that it was worthless.

"Luther mutilated the Bible!" cry the papists. This is supposed to give the impression that Rome holds the Bible in high esteem. Rome holds the Bible in high esteem?! Did they not at Trent first speak of tradition and put it on a par with the Word of God, without explaining what is and what is not tradition? Did not Pope Pius IV in his Bull "**Dominici Gregis**" of
March 24, 1565, the Holy Scriptures, in so far as they are printed in a language understandable to the people, are counted among the forbidden books.

and actually put it on the disreputable "Index"? Does it betray reverence for the Bible as the beatific word of God when Pius IV confirms these words of the Tridentine Jndex Commission in his bull: "But whoever, without such permission - from the confessor - misses to read or possess the sacred writings, shall not be able to receive absolution from sins before he has delivered them to the Ordinary"? Did not Pius IX condemn in the most intemperate terms the Bible Societies which have made it their business to spread the dear Holy Scriptures as far as possible? Rome wants neither an unmutilated nor a mutilated Bible. It wants - what? The Jesuit Perrone answers in his paper, "Is the Immaculate Conception . . . dogmatically definable?" (1847), "Neither the Bible nor tradition is necessary to the definition of an article of faith. It is sufficient to assume a secret tradition, which is preserved in the magisterium of the Church . . until at last at some time it also comes out into the open." What Perrone only hints at here, Pius IX stated clearly and unmistakably in the bold words, "**La tradizione son Io**! Tradition is me!" Rome wants neither Bible nor Tradition, Rome wants the Pope and nothing more. The Pope is to her "the way and the truth and the life," the only infallible source of all revelation. So what is the cry, "Luther has mutilated the Bible!" really all about? 'Tis wind, vain wind! It remains with Luther's judgment in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "The papacy is also a vain enthusiasm - **merus enthusiasmus** - in which the pope boasts that all rights are in the shrine of his heart, and what he judges and says with his churches, that is to be spirit and law, even if it is above and against Scripture or the oral word." (Müller, p. 321.)

Jul. A. Friedrich.

## The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church.

"Behold, the winter is past, the rain is gone and gone; the flowers are sprung up in the land, the spring is come, and the turtledove is heard in our land; the fig tree is knotted, the vines are eyed, and give forth their odor," Gal. 2:11-13. Thus the seven thousand could rejoice when, about the year 1517, after a long, anxious winter night, a new spiritual spring at last began to make its entrance into the church. As early as 1509, when he had received his doctorate as a "**baccalaureus tamquam ad Biblia**," Luther began to dispute the principles of sophistry, which was then in vogue everywhere, and to ask for a certain reason for our blessedness, and held the writings of the prophets and apostles in higher esteem.

and more certain than all scholastic wisdom, tradition and traditional interpretation, so that already at that time D. Mellerstadt said: "The monk will mislead all doctors and bring up a new doctrine and reform the whole Roman church, because he rests on the prophets and apostles' Scriptures and stands on the word of Jesus Christ, which no one can overturn and refute either with philosophy or sophistry, Albertianism, Thomisticism and the whole Tardaret. (Meurer, Luthers Leben, p. 35.) Greedy as he was for the sensible and pure milk, Luther, under the guidance of the Spirit, who creates willing and accomplishment, could not fail to increase steadily in knowledge. His sermons, lectures, and disputations from that time bear ample witness to this, as does the fact that, while churches everywhere were otherwise quite empty, not only the chapel in the Augustinian monastery at Wittenberg, but also the castle church there was too small when Luther preached. Even in those days the voice of the "good shepherd" resounded through his sermon, though still in many a discordant tone: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest!"

But while until now the newly dawned light was still under a bushel and only in isolated cases sent its rays beyond the borders of Wittenberg (e.g. through letters), now the dawn of a new day broke with the wonderful rapid announcement of the 95 Theses. "The true treasure of the church is the most holy gospel of the glory and grace of God. But this treasure is cheaply the most odious of all, because it makes the first to be last." Such were the 62nd and 63rd theses, from which it is evident that Luther, with all the errors which still clung to him, had yet grasped the very core of the Christian religion, the article of the justification of a poor sinner before God by grace alone, for Christ's sake, through faith. And the blessed light that emanates from this sun must have dispelled all the darkness that still existed in him.

About the same time that the Wittenberg nightingale began to be heard, new singers were also heard in Switzerland. The Swiss Reformation cannot be traced back to one person with the same certainty as the German Reformation, but Zwingli is without doubt the most important of all Calvin's forerunners. Zwingli first worked in Glarus, where he became acquainted with Erasmus, the head of the Enlightenment movement. He calls him "the greatest philosopher and theologian," while Erasmus addresses him as his "brotherly beloved friend." While the affection that Luther initially had for Erasmus soon turned into the opposite, since Luther soon saw through him, Zwingli and Erasmus never came to an actual understanding.

break. This fact sheds significant light on Zwingli's direction of thought.

Zwingli left Glarus in 1516 "because his moral reputation had suffered," and moved to Einsiedeln and three years later to Zurich. Zwingli himself claims, and we have no reason to doubt his claim, that he began preaching the Gospel of Christ as early as 1516, even before he heard anything from Luther. For the first seven or eight years, that is, until the year 1524, Luther and Zwingli were not only united in their testimony against the abominations of the Papacy, but were also in complete agreement in doctrine. This even the more sincere Reformed have admitted again and again. As to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in particular, F. A. Lampe, in his Church History, writes: "As to Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he confesses that he was at first partial to Luther's opinion." Yes, as late as the year 1523, October 9, Zwingli wrote to Geroldseggen, "Christ offered his body and blood after the Lord's Supper"; further, in the same year, in the German Interpretation of his Articles, "These words are clear and known to all men: 'This is my body. Is not this pure, brief, certain word of God? How could God have spoken more certainly and truly?" And also to the reproach that he was a Lutheran, he answers in the same year: "Luther is such an excellent fighter for God, as in a thousand years on earth there never was one, and with the manly unmoved mind, with which he attacked the Pope at Rome, no one has ever been equal to him, as long as the papacy has granted. Praise be to God! through him an innumerable world more than through me and others is led to God. That I have not written a letter to him all my days, I have thereby wished to open to all men, how unanimous the Spirit of God is, that we, so far apart, yet so unanimously teach the doctrine of Christ without all attack." (Cf. "Lutherans" 1, 50 ff.) How Zwingli dared later to assert to these his own statements, "**quod in vita sua nunquam crediderit, corpus Christi in coena dispensari,**" is difficult to comprehend.

Thus Luther and Zwingli worked for a number of years in the same spirit and in the same opinion. Oh that it had remained so! O that the sad division between the German and Swiss Churches had never arisen, of which it is only too true what Luther wrote to Bucer: "You can believe me that I would wish to calm and quiet this discord, even if I had to recite my life three times. For I have seen how necessary your society is to us, what trouble it (the schism) has brought and is still bringing to the Gospel, so that I am sure that all the gates of hell, the whole papacy, the whole Turk, the whole world, the whole flesh, and what is more will be destroyed.

is evil everywhere, could not have done so much harm to the gospel if we were of one mind. . . . May the Lord JEsus enlighten us and make us perfectly one! This I ask, after this I lament, after this I groan." (XVII, 2396.)

But how did this disastrous division come about? Who is to blame? In the year 1524 the notorious iconoclast and haughty Gernegroß, Carlstadt, came forth with a doctrine of the Lord's Supper in which he denied the essential presence of the invisible elements. When Carlstadt's books containing this doctrine came to Zurich, the council of the city became so alarmed at this new teaching that they forbade the sale of these books. But although Carlstadt was the originator of this false doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he could never have brought about a schism in the Protestant Church by it. If the highly respected Zwingli had not soon taken up Carlstadt's evil cause, the latter would have made just as much of a fiasco with this latest raving as with all the previous ones. Zwingli is therefore to blame for this disastrous division of the Protestant Church, which continues to this day.

The first hint that he had changed his mind about the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is found in Zwingli's letter of November 16, 1524, in which he writes that he had come to the conclusion that the words "this is my body" meant something like "this means my body," and adds that he was imploring the recipient to keep this letter secret. Zwingli was therefore still hesitant to go public with this opinion, for he was well aware of the confusion he would cause. Soon, however, he grew bolder. As yet Luther had not offended him with a word, when already in his book "Of True and False Religion," published in 1525, he called all those who believed the true and essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper "carnivores," "a dull class of men," and their doctrine "impious, foolish, and monstrous, belonging among cannibals." In a second book, published shortly after, he called the Lutherans "man-eaters" and their doctrine an "idolatry"; nay, he even asserts that to believe that the eating of Christ's flesh strengthens the conscience is to lose one's blessedness. Zwingli himself ascribes to a dream in which a spirit appeared to him, and he does not know whether it was a white or a black one, the certainty which he has so suddenly gained, and with which he now stands up for a doctrine of which he knew nothing a year ago, and about which he only dared to express an "opinion" under the seal of secrecy. This spirit pointed him to Exodus 12. Zwingli's teaching is therefore based on a dream; and we also know that the spirit that appeared to him was not a white spirit, not a good spirit, but a cacodemon from hell.

It is now beyond the limits we have set ourselves for this work to describe the further course of the sad sacramental controversy; but a brief glance at the Marburg Religious Discussion may be necessary.

After several attempts to heal the ever-widening rift between the German and Swiss churches, the Reformed succeeded in 1529 in persuading the Landgrave Philip of Hesse to use his influence in favor of a colloquy. In Philip's case, it was mainly political reasons that induced him to work with all his strength toward a unification of the contending parties. Only reluctantly, out of consideration for the Landgrave, and in order that he might not be reproached with bearing the guilt for the continuance of the discord - a reproach which was nevertheless made to him and is still made today - Luther induced him to consent to such a colloquy. For he foresaw, and said so, that the Reformed were not at all concerned with true peace, and that the whole matter flowed from dishonest motives. Especially with regard to Zwingli, he said: "To deal with him is quite unfruitful."

The outcome of the discussion showed how correctly Luther had judged the Swiss. Although agreement was reached on fourteen articles of faith in which differences had arisen since the beginning of the dispute, and in such a way that the Reformed declared Luther's teaching to be correct in these matters, no agreement was reached with regard to the Lord's Supper. At the conclusion of the fifteen articles, written by Luther and signed by' all present, it is said, "And though we have not at present compared ourselves as to whether the true body and blood of Christ be bodily in the bread and wine, yet let one part show Christian love towards the other, so far as any conscience can ever suffer, and let both parts diligently beseech God that he will confirm to us by his Spirit the right understanding. Amen." (Meurer, 428.) Notwithstanding existing disagreement in doctrine, yet the Reformed now desired to be acknowledged as brethren in the faith. Luther spoke harshly to them about this and said, "how they could take him and his friends for brethren if they thought they were mistaken; this was a sign that they did not greatly esteem their own cause. He then refused them the hand of a brother in the faith, saying, "Ye have another spirit."

Zwingli's school of thought was, as the foregoing shows, a thoroughly rationalistic one. It appears so clearly in him and his friends that even some respected Reformed theologians do not deny it. Zwingli, after all, characterizes himself and his own as "**turba ista, quae nihil credit, nisi quod verum esse videt.**" With respect to the Swiss, therefore, Luther's judgment would be recognized as accurate even from the Reformed side. Now in order to

In order to avoid the necessary but rather unfortunate consequences of these concessions, many attempts have been made to draw a huge distinction between Zwingli and his "great successor". Ströbel writes on this point: "One has wanted to burden Calvin with the role of a mediator between the Lutheran and the Zwinglian way of thinking, but there is no mediator between Zwingli and Luther. If Calvin had been of a different mind and spirit than his co-religionist in Zurich, a **CConsensus Tigurinus** could not have come about. On the contrary, the **Mutuus consensus Tigurinae ecclesiae Calvini, Farelli, reliquorumque fidelium Geneventium et Neocomensium ecclesiae ministrorum, which was** concluded in 1549, has always been regarded as proof that they, agreeing with Zwingli's mind and spirit, would have completely agreed with the Zurich church, which adhered to this mind and spirit, just as Calvin never denied his spiritual affinity with Zwingli. All that can be conceded in the present case, according to the testimony of history, amounts to this, that the French Reformed emphasized some things as especially important, which the actual Swiss relegated to the background as unessential; as it will subsequently be shown that the Genevans brought nothing to light which the Zurichers had not known before. We should therefore abandon this empty conceit, and not wish to determine the relation between the heads of the Reformed Church otherwise than they themselves have determined it, namely, that in all essential points Zwingli thought and acted like Calvin, Ecolampadius like Farell, Carlstadt like Beza; that consequently also none may be opposed to the other or separated from him, because they all did their work in one mind and spirit, and therefore also one of them stands for all and all for one." (Journal IV, 79.)

With all doctrinal differences, therefore, as they are found in the Reformed Church in the narrower sense, and which in this Church in the broader sense, namely in the sheer innumerable daughter churches of the same, come to light to a greater degree, it is always one and the same spirit that pervades the whole, it is always one and the same basic direction to which all differences and diversions can be traced. Yes, the very fact that the Reformed Church recognizes people of different denominations as brethren in the faith, and still today, as in Marburg, with tearful eyes even approaches the Lutheran Church for brethren in the faith, is one of the very strongest signs of its other spirit. It is the spirit that finds its harmonious formation in doubt, in contradictions, contrasts, and colorful opinions.

In the following we intend to demonstrate the "other spirit" in detail at several points. H. Spd.

(Conclusion follows.)

# What does Scripture teach about the soul?

(Sent in by resolution of the Middle Conference District of Northern Illinois by H-h.)

(Conclusion.)

**3. the immortality of the soul.**

To try to prove the immortality of the human soul against outspoken materialists (or modern "monists") would be a wasted effort. With all our logic and ingenuity, we can go no farther than Plato has already gone, namely, to the probability that the spirit of man is immortal, since it is endowed with reason by God, and thus stands infinitely higher than the animal, since it never comes to satisfaction and rest in this life, and since in this life some crimes are not atoned for, and thus require punishment after death. However, neither philosophy nor reason can give us incontrovertible certainty concerning immortality.

It is a different matter with those who still acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as God's Word, or at least want to let them be the rule, guideline, and foundation of their faith. When such as the Socinians and Adventists deny the immortality of the soul, it is comparatively easy to prove that such a denial is contrary to the Word of God. For in both Testaments, Old and New, it is undoubtedly taught that the soul of man is immortal, incorruptible.

We will try to show this from several statements of Scripture. We will begin with the New Testament, because it seems to testify to the immortality of the soul more directly, explicitly, and frequently than the Old Testament.

1. Proof from the New Testament that the soul is immortal. - The Lord says Matth. 10, 28 explicitly that the body can be killed, but not the soul. But that which cannot be killed is immortal. Augustine says: "How can I be sure that the soul will not die? Listen to the Lord himself, who assures his servant of this: 'Fear not them which kill the body, and cannot kill the soul!' So the soul is certainly immortal." If any Socinian or Adventist should wish to reply that the clause following this does say, "But rather fear him who may destroy both soul and body in hell," and that since "destroy" is parallel to "kill" in the clause preceding it, it also signifies the same thing, and therefore at least this is expressed here, that the souls of the wicked would be killed in hell, and so would not remain alive, and so would not be immortal, we reply: From the **parallelism membrorum,** one can never with certainty

Therefore, let us rather stick to the wording. When it is said of the body and soul of the wicked that God will "destroy" them in hell, this refers to the punishment of hell, the eternal torment, the "eternal destruction" (2 Thess. 1:9), which will be inflicted on the wicked at the Last Judgment. An actual dying or being killed in 'the sense in which the body is said to be killed, this cannot be, because the death of the body lasts but a moment (considered as an act), while the Scripture testifies that the torment of hell lasts from eternity to eternity, Apoc. 20, 10. 20, 10. But if it will be an "everlasting destruction" (2 Thess. 1, 9), and "the smoke of their torment shall ascend forever and ever" (Apoc. 14, 10), then also the body and soul of those who are in hell will "live" from eternity to eternity, will be immortal. However, this eternal corruption in hell is also called a death, "the other death"; yet a precise definition is given in Scripture concerning this expression, "This other death is the lake of fire (or lake of fire)," Apoc. 20:14. 20, 14. And thus all pretense is withdrawn from all misconception, as if the other death were an annihilation and cessation of the damned. - From the words of the Lord, Matt. 10:28, it follows irrefutably that the soul does not die when the body is killed; that the souls of the wicked will have their bodies again in hell; and that in hell they will be "destroyed" by the Lord, that is, punished with eternal torment and chastisement, and suffer, as it were, an eternal death, the "other death.

The doctrine of the eternity of the punishments of hell is the great stumbling-block which must be the downfall of those who judge God according to the standard of their reason and imagination, and according to the fanciful love-pleasures of their hearts, which are alienated from God's Word, and even of those who seek their righteousness before God in their own work, and to whom their conscience therefore always reproaches that they will not stand before God's judgment. They then seek at least to console themselves by denying the eternity of the infernal punishment, and by distorting the clear statements of Scripture. But clear statements of Scripture are not so easily perverted: every impartial man who takes the Scripture as it reads soon understands what it means.

When Mark 9:43 says of hell that it is an unquenchable fire, vv. 44-48 repeat the same three times, and each time the torment of hell as an eternal one is also emphasized by the words: "since their worm does not die and their fire does not go out", then this is truly spoken clearly enough. The Saviour evidently refers to the words with which the prophet Isaiah closes his book, where he describes the damned as "the corpses of the people who believe in God".

and with this expression also characterizes the eternal torment of hell as eternal death.

That the souls of those who are now already in hell actually exist, while their bodies have long since turned to dust, that such souls can also feel, e.g. hear, is undoubtedly also evident from the words 1 Petr. 3, 19, where it is said that Christ, after being made alive, went and preached to the spirits of those who formerly had not believed the preaching of Noah. Since by the "prison" ***(φυλακή) is meant the*** place where the

If the spirits of the former unbelievers are to be preserved, this can only be understood as what the Scriptures otherwise call "hell". This passage teaches us for our purpose once that the souls of these unbelievers had not been destroyed with their death in the flood of sin, but had existed for millennia without a body, for they are called spirits ***(πνεύματα)***; so

But then also this, that they were sentient, for otherwise Christ had not preached to them. Finally, they were in prison, that is, at any rate not in the place of blessedness, but in a place of torment, which they also could not leave.

The Lord teaches us the same in the parable of the rich man and the poor Lazarus, Luk. 16, 19-31. If it was a real story or just a parable does not change the teaching of this passage in the least. In both cases the Lord's purpose in telling this story is the same: He wants to teach us that from the circumstances of this life, whether we are well or not, no conclusion can be drawn as to our state of grace before God. In the second part, which might be called the main part because of its comprehensiveness, he gives us a glimpse into the hereafter to teach us about the fate of departed souls. The Lord says of the rich man, who lived gloriously and joyfully all his days, that he died and was buried. His body was therefore consigned to the earth with great honor ("buried," not mentioned at all in Lazarus). And while his body lay in the earth, he was in hell and in torment. He, his very self, his soul, was thus in the "place of torment" ***(τόπος τής βασάνου,*** v. 28), and had to suffer.

(Obviously the Lord here refers to Ps. 49, 15: "They lie in" etc.) Who in view of this teaching of our Lord JEsu claims (like the Adventists, "**Scripture Ref.",** p. 28) that here "the people who are in Hades are made out to be alive, similar to the way animals and trees are made to speak in parables today", obviously slaps the Scriptures in the face, they look for an excuse to be able to deny what God just wants to teach them. And in so doing they do not notice how they strike themselves; for if there are "people" in "Hades," they are also alive; dead men are not called people,

but dead bodies. And what shall we think of this, that the Lord hath caused corpses to speak, and for what purpose?

If we have seen so far that the souls of the wicked live on after the death of the body, but in hellish torment, let us now look at some statements of Scripture as to the fate of the souls of the righteous after death.

Act. 7, 59 Stephen prays: "Lord JEsu, receive my spirit!" And then he "fell asleep". From this it is clear that the spirit (soul) of Stephen went to his Saviour, while the body fell asleep and was put into his sleeping chamber by godly people, Act. 8, 2. But the Lord Jesus, whom Stephen called upon and to whom his spirit went, was neither in Hades nor in the grave, nor in any other place than at the right hand of God, that is, in glory, in the heaven of the blessed. And that this prayer of Stephen did not arise from a false delusion, as a scripture twister could pretend, is evident from the testimony of Scripture, which says that Stephen was filled with the Holy Spirit (Act. 7, 55), and also from the words of the apostle Paul, who says of himself:

Phil. 1, 23: "I have an intention to depart and be with Christ, which is far better" (v. 24). So his I, fine spirit, wanted to be with Christo in heavenly joy. In the same way he says in 2 Cor. 5:8 that his home is with Christ, but believers are on earth in a foreign land, after he has assured us in 2 Cor. 5:1 ff. that "as soon as the tent house of our earthly body is broken down, there will be a building prepared for us in heaven, an eternal dwelling place before God. Should he have meant the grave or "Hades" (Sheol) with such expressions, as some fools think?

Another passage which tells us that the souls of believers enter into heavenly blessedness immediately after "laying aside their earthly tabernacle" (2 Pet. 1, 14), is the promise which the HER made on the cross to the penitent thief: Luk. 23, 43. The latter asked, "HER, remember me when thou comest (or: hast come) into thy kingdom!" He asked the Lord, therefore, to remember him in grace when he came again into his glory for judgment, to reveal his kingdom, and to give to his own the glorious inheritance of his kingdom. That this is the meaning of the request is evident from a comparison with 2 Tim. 4, 1 and Matth. 25, 34. And since the thief was probably caught up in the Jewish delusion (which is further developed and fixed in the Talmud), that only with the resurrection on the last day the eternal bliss would be granted to the faithful, the Lord promises him with an affirmation that he should enter paradise with Him this very day. The "today" in this promise is to destroy the wrong opinion of the thief;

it is contrary to the day of Christ's coming in His kingdom. For this reason alone the Lord could not have said, "Verily I say unto thee this day, thou shalt," etc., as the Adventists interpose. In other respects also it would be absurd to suppose such a thing; for that the HER did not say it to him yesterday or the day after to-morrow, the thief knew already quite by himself.

Several other passages, according to which the souls of those who die in the Lord are transferred to Paradise, are: Apok. 6, 9; 20, 4; 14, 13'; also Matth. 22, 32 (Luk. 20, 38; Mark. 12, 27), where Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are called living before God.

2. Proof from the Old Testament that the soul is immortal. - Franz Delitzsch says (Come, to Isa., ch. 65): "Of a blessed hereafter the Old Testament knows nothing at all. Beyond this world lies Hades, Sheol," etc. (Quoted in Ber. der Freik. 1885, 37.) It did not occur to him, of course, to deny the immortality of the soul; but he was inclined to the Roman error that it was only through Christ's descent into hell that the Old Testament believers were delivered from Sheol and introduced into the heavenly paradise.

Adventists and other enthusiasts claim that "Sheol" is only used in one meaning, namely that it only refers to the "grave". In this they then seek a "proof" for their reverie that the Old Testament knows nothing of immortality.

From certain passages in the Old Testament, however, it is clear that the Old Testament believers believed both in the immortality of the soul and in the fact that they went to God and to the blessed rest of God's people immediately after their bodily death (or departure from this world). If these two truths are not expressed in such clear and explicit terms as in the New Testament, the reason is that at that time it was not necessary to emphasize and elaborate such well-known truths. Everyone in Israel knew from childhood that "the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and that no torment shall touch them. It was not until after the exile and the time of the prophets that a pious writer found it necessary to emphasize this truth against the increasing ignorance and unbelief when he wrote: "God created man for eternal life, and made him in the image to be like himself. But by the envy of the devil death entered into the world; and they that are of his part help it also. But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no pain touches them. They are regarded by the unwise as if they were dying, and their departure is counted as a punishment, and their going as a destruction; but they are at peace," Weish. 2, 23 ff.

Gen. 5, 24 is the first passage where the blessed entrance of a man to God is described. Enoch led a godly life and "God took him away". The taking away is expressed by **lakach**, and means "to accept, to receive, **ad se recipere" (Gerh., comm.$_s$ ad 1**.). Enoch, then, was "taken up to God," and surely by this nothing else can be signified than his transfer to a "blessed hereafter," to heaven. For "our God is in heaven."

A very similar description we read in the ascension of Elijah, whom the holy angels brought to heaven in the form of fiery chariots and horses, 2 Kings 2, 11.[1] ) Among these fiery figures angels appeared, which are not only called seraphim (from **saraph**, to burn; compare also 2 Kings 6, 17), but are also compared to "flames of fire", Ps. 104, 4. So it is also said in Luk 46, 22, that the angels carried the soul of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom. Now we are told in Matth. 17 that Moses and Elijah appeared to the Lord on the mount of transfiguration as messengers from heaven, when they spoke with the Lord about the end that He was to fulfill in Jerusalem, especially since they also appeared in glory, Luk. 9, 30 f. So both were already in heaven. But of Moses it is not said, as of Elijah, that he was taken alive to heaven, but that he died on Mount Nebo, and that the Lord himself buried his body, Deut. 34:6. 34:6 Since Moses entered into heavenly glory by his death, as is evident from the light that falls on his present state from the New Testament, the manner in which his impending death was announced to him must also have this meaning, that it signifies his transfer into blessedness. These are the words, "be gathered unto his people." "Gather thyself unto thy people," saith the Lord unto him Deut. 32, 50. These words we also read Gen. 25, 8 of Abraham's, 35, 29 of Isaac's, 49, 29 of Jacob's death, of which also the Lord testifies that they "feast in the kingdom of heaven," Matth. 8, 11.

The result of this compilation of various scriptural statements of the Old in the light of the New Testament lies clear and unmistakable before the eyes of every unbiased person. It is none other than this, that the believers of the Old Covenant, immediately after their departure from this world, were "gathered to their people," that is, as has just been proved, received into the glory of eternal life. They did not, therefore, have to wait in a misinterpreted Sheol until Christ's Ascension into Hell, or even until the Last Day. Except for the extraordinary graces of Enoch and Elijah, they did not have to wait until the

1) Of course Elijah, as well as Enoch, is at the same time transferred to heaven according to his body.

In the first place, bodily death was the door to heaven, the means by which the faithful were "taken up to God". So also today, as Stephen and the thief show us.

Another passage is Is. 63, 16, where the prophet says: "Abraham does not know about us, and Israel does not know about us. In these words the existence, the life of Abraham and Isaac is presupposed; but even though they live, that is, in heaven, they no longer care about the things of this world, they no longer know anything about them.

Is. 57, 1. 2 it says of the righteous that they "come to peace" when they are "snatched away from calamity". But "to come to peace" cannot possibly mean anything else than to attain to blessedness; for **shalom** is the epitome of all good for the Israelite.

In addition to Dan. 12:13, I conclude by referring to Eccl. 12:7, where Solomon says in unequivocal terms that "the dust must return to the earth as it was, and the spirit back to God who gave it." When Adventists remark on this last passage: "The breath of life, or life-principle, which God gave to man, returns again to him who gave it, yet never as a rational and understanding being, but simply as a life-principle; and this men cannot destroy," it is obvious to every sensible man, if we do not leave out of sight the statements of Scripture which we have just discussed, that only the most shameful deceit and perversion of Scripture can interpret the words of Solomon in such a way, since, after all, Solomon in this very book always refers to the judgment which will take place after death. Only one step further, and such enthusiasts have happily arrived at Buddhism with its Nirvana, into which the soul is to be absorbed forever.

By the way, I am of the certain opinion that among the expressions of the Old Testament (e.g. Is. 45, 22; Ps. 31, 6; 91, 16; Lev. 18, 5, compare with Luk. 10, 28 and countless others) also the blessed state of the faithful in the hereafter was expressed unambiguously and unmistakably for the contemporaries of the Old Testament, even if even learned Hebrews today no longer understand such expressions in their full meaning, since it is just a "dead" (and yet so full of life) language. -

What Scripture says about the present condition of the soul corrupted by sin (e.g. Ps. 51, 7; Job 14, 4; Ps. 14; Joh. 3, 6; Rom. 5, 12; Eph. 2, 1. 5) belongs under the doctrine of original sin.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

In the past year the Ohioans have again confessed to **their well-known restriction of sola gratia.** A few passages may follow here. The "Theologische Zeitblätter" (1909, p. 106) teach that "in the election of grace, as in conversion, and consequently in the actual attainment of blessedness, something depends on the conduct of man (foreseen in the election of grace) towards the converting and saving grace of God, that it is not the same what kind of conduct this is, that the actual attainment of blessedness in this sense is also dependent on it and not only on God and His grace. Ohio, then, maintains that conversion and the real attainment of blessedness is co-dependent on the conduct of man, and not solely on God and his grace. Probably never has this denial of **sola gratia** been advanced even by open synergists with such fanaticism and vehemence as in the infamous words of the Ohio "Church Newspaper" of 1885 (p. 76): "We think it unchristian and heathenish to say that the real attainment of blessedness depends in no respect on man's conduct toward the grace of God, but in every respect on God alone. A minister who preaches and pastors according to such ungodly doctrine is a wolf and an apostle of devils." These awful words are thus defended by the "Time Sheets" (p. 108): "Our sentence, which has often been adduced by Missourians as a scarecrow for anxious minds not exactly acquainted with our doctrinal position, is plain enough in itself to any one who will but look at it properly and not misunderstand it. He says, however, that our blessedness does not depend in all respects on God alone. This may at best be misunderstood; but for this very reason, in order to cut off every misunderstanding, it says beforehand that the real attainment of blessedness is in some respects dependent on man's conduct towards the grace of God, that it is therefore not the same for our blessedness how we conduct ourselves towards the converting and beatifying grace, whether we accept it by virtue of the powerful influence of that very grace, or whether we reject and reject it in spite of it. And in this sense, and in this sense only, we say, the real attainment (not the acquisition and offering of it) is not dependent on God alone; for if it were, he would have to work irresistibly with his grace. All this is already evident to an intelligent reader in that sentence itself; but it has also been repeatedly and expressly explained in detail." That the acquisition and offering of blessedness is a matter of **sola gratia,** the "Zeitblätter" allow. But as to the actual attainment of blessedness, they maintain that it depends not only on God and His grace, but also on the conduct of man toward the grace of God. But they are silent as to whether the Ohioans still consider the Lutherans to be wolves and apostles of the devil, for they know only **sola gratia in the** acquisition and real attainment of blessedness, and preach and pastorate according to it. Even

the "Zeitblätter" seem to feel no desire to provide **analogues to** the **dictum of the** "Kirchenzeitung" of 1885 in this respect as well.

F. B.

**Of man's participation and activity for good** before he has faith, the Ohio "Zeitblätter" wrote in 1909 (p. 283): "Man should not want to wait carelessly and idly for his conversion, but be active for good even before the completion of it." "The human will can be active for good even before the completion of his conversion." "If conversion is not the work of a moment, but has its beginnings and its progress, neither is the human will transformed in a moment, but it gradually becomes more and more, and consequently is enabled to be active for good even before the completion of conversion. And that good which man is able to do, let him do it." By consummation of conversion the "Zeitblätter" understand the gift of faith. Further, p. 287: "If, then, the struggle between the flesh and the Spirit begins with the '**prima initia fidei et conversionis,' it does** not begin only with the complete **conversio**, but already before. And in this struggle, of course, the will of man is active: **Manifestum est, illam luctam non fieri sine motu nostrae volun tatis.'** So there we would have an activity, a synergy of the human will for the good, even before faith and rebirth are there? Yes certainly; but not before the effect of 'the Spirit of regeneration' is there, not before that Spirit has worked; not a synergy from natural forces, but from the new forces and impulses wrought by the Holy Spirit." Page 288: "To us men an activity (**partes**) for good comes in conversion, in conversion, not after it." Of this synergism and the above limitation of **SOLA gratia** the Ohioans assert (e. g. Th. Zbl. 1909, p. 178): it is exactly the same doctrine as that of the Lutheran Confession, which also all the ancient dogmatists understood exactly as Ohio did. But even concerning the dogmatists of the 17th century, the "Theologische Quartalschrift" (6, 216) remarks: "We will not admit that the proof" [the doctrine of the Ohioans agreed with the doctrine of the dogmatists] "has been furnished; those dogmatists did not dream that after two hundred years their mode of exposition would be so exploited as has happened and is still happening. "

F. B.

**Naïve judgment on the election of grace controversy.** The Matt. of St. Catherine's Synod in South America writes about the Grace Election Controversy: "In our opinion, it is not the doctrinal difference, but mainly the rebuked way of fighting that is the cause that the controversy has not yet been settled. For both parts contend for the jewel, that we are saved by grace alone, Missouri in opposition to all and every works righteousness (the Roman way), Ohio in opposition to everything that could give the grace of God the appearance of arbitrariness (the Reformed way). On such a basis there ought to come peace, true peace, in which there is no hidden war, which does not subdue enemies, but unites friends." Ohio teaches, "Conversion and blessedness evidently do not depend in all respects on God and his grace alone, because otherwise all men would be converted and blessed. Nevertheless, Ohio should also fight for **SOLA gratia**!

F. B.

**Of the German work of the General Council**, the Council's new paper, The German Lutheran, writes: "No one will deny that the General Council of the Lutheran Church in North America has German interests. It grew originally out of German synods. A large proportion of its pastors and congregations are still German today. Whole synods use only the German language in their proceedings, and nowhere are the prospects for the growth of the General Council more favorable than in the field of German native mission. It would also be wrong to deny that the General Council is again beginning to look after its German interests. For a long time, to be sure, it has seemed as if the tasks assigned to the German part of this body were being unduly neglected and deferred. Individuals, even individual synods, made a start, even made heroic efforts here and there to promote the German work, but there was a lack of planned, purposeful action with united forces. From this it may be explained that the history of the German Lutheran Church in this country, and especially of the German native mission (the word taken in its general sense, without reflection on the official authority), in spite of all the sacrifices made and all the successes achieved, is a history of missed opportunities. Of late the German interests in the General Council seem again to be receiving greater attention. Not only the German Synods are waking up to more active work in all areas, but also the English part of our Church is showing a friendly interest in our special needs and tasks. This was also evident at the last meeting of the General Council in Minneapolis. Two tasks in particular are set for the German part of the General Council, namely, 1. the gathering of German congregations, and 2. the training of German pastors." Not only the General Council, but also the General Synod is at present working with great zeal in the German language. Unfortunately, however, it has hitherto been a much diluted, corrupt, and Unionistic Lutheranism to which they have sought to give entrance.

F- B.

**Revivals, which we also advocate.** The ***Lutheran World*** writes:

"The *United Lutheran* is in favor of revivals. It thinks that we need a revival, and it is no doubt right. But our Lutheran cotemporary is careful to define what it means by the revival it advocates. It produces a fine bit of definition. It says: 'A revival of the old-time thorough training of the children in God's Word and the Catechism is what the church needs above all else. A revival of daily family prayers and home Christianity and daily home use of God's Word and our Lutheran books of devotion; of parents' showing by their daily walk and conversation that the kingdom of God and His righteousness is their chief concern in life and should be the children's chief object in life; of love for the house of God and His church and His work; of genuine piety; of the sincere spirituality created and sustained by the Holy Spirit through the faithful use of God's Word and the blessed sacrament of the Lord's Supper; of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, - such a revival would reinfuse the home and the church with a strong, sustaining power for the saving of the lost and wayward souls. Let us revive the Christian hometraining and the Christian school for the young. This is the revival of the

**church needs**.' "This is what Walther and the Missourians have been striving for for 70 years: especially Christian parochial schools for the youth. But among the bitterest opponents of these **revivals** in America during this period were precisely the leaders of the General Synod: Schmucker, Kurtz, Sprecher, Brown, and others. It took more than half a century before people like the writer in the General Synod showed a little more understanding for the above genuine Lutheran **revivals.** And how long will it be before these General Synodists will really have such an attitude in the flesh and blood and will, for example, also set up a system of Christian parochial schools?

F. B.

**The monthly fashionable paper, Delineator,** mentioned elsewhere in this paper, opens its first number of this year with an editorial on the new theatre in the city of New York, with the headline, "A Brilliant Assembly of Beautiful Women and Famous Men at the Opening of the New Theatre." The writer of the article says she set out in good time to observe the restless, irresistible wave of light and life and color that poured through the many entrances, but that her **street car,** as it turned from Fifth Avenue into 59th Street, was brought to a sudden halt by a long procession of carriages and motors, probably half a mile long, moving slowly toward 62nd Street. Then describing the theatrical audience, she said she had never seen anything like it in her life in dress splendour and splendour. A correspondent of a London paper, who had made the trip across the ocean especially for this purpose, confessed that he had not seen such splendor of dress and jnwelen since the coronation of King Edward. A few weeks ago we saw a picture from the same city of New York, which represented a very different scene, namely, a whole row of hungry and partly ragged people having bread administered to them in front of a bakery, which a charitable philanthropist regularly gives them as a gift at certain hours. So in one place the glory of this world, wealth, splendour, carnality, lust for the eyes, and a proud nature, purple and delicious linen, in the other place the bitter poverty, the poor Lazarus. The same contrast is reported from Berlin. What splendor was not unfolded on New Year's Day at the court and on the part of the nobility and the higher official world! On the other hand, we read that in the month of September the night asylum for the homeless in Fröbelstrasse housed no less than 55,000 people. In view of such conditions, should one be surprised at the growth of Socialism? One is almost tempted to exclaim with that king of France, when it began to grow sultry from his throne, "After us the flood!" (L. Z. B.)

## II. Abroad.

**In the Borromeo encyclical of May 19,** which aroused great displeasure and many protests in Germany, Pius X identifies himself with the blasphemies and shameless lies of Janssen, Denifles, and other Roman blasphemers. Cardinal Borromeo was a man after the Pope's own heart, for his plan was to promote the Gospel and its

The two main weapons of the Antichrist, lies and murder, were used to exterminate the confessors. Borromeo was therefore canonized by the Pope not long after his death, and now he has been celebrated again by Pius X as a true son of Rome in the Borromeo Encyclical. Thus, at the same time, the present great hypocrite in Rome, who likes to be called the "Pope of Peace," has publicly avowed himself to the purposes and methods of Borromeo. And in the encyclical itself Pius X makes equally extensive use of Borromeo's method. In particular, there are two old, crude lies which Pius X here again serves up to the world: 1. the Reformers were rebellious, immoral, vicious, sensual people; 2. the Reformation itself was the source of all heresies and also of today's Modernism and Liberalism. The daily press in the United States, which usually reports widely on every sensation with predilection, has all but hushed up the whole exciting Borromeo affair: a new proof that our press has a Jesuit gag in its mouth. In Germany, however, the papal encyclical was decisively condemned at numerous meetings, while at the same time the Luther monuments were adorned with many wreaths. A lively activity was developed by the "Evangelical League," which first and loudest raised its voice against the invectives of the Pope, and through Church Councillor D. Meyer in Zwickau issued an "Appeal," in which it called upon the Saxons to preserve the honor of Protestantism and to put the Pope, who was filled with hatred of the Protestant spiritual and religious possessions, in his place. Protest meetings were especially numerous in Bavaria, where Archbishop Albert had published the encyclical in Latin in his diocesan gazette. Even Catholics did not conceal their disapproval of the papal invective. The Catholic King Frederick Augustus of Saxony wrote to the Pope expressing his deepest regret at the encyclical. And a considerable portion of the Catholic press in Germany declared, though somewhat timidly, that they would rather not have seen the Pope's attack on the Reformation, and remarked that such historical judgments of the Pope had no claim to infallibility. Testimony from Catholics against the Pope's circular was also published elsewhere.

**The "Chr. W." communicates the most opprobrious passage of the encyclical in Latin.** It reads, "Inter haec superbi ac rebelles homines consurgebant, inimici Crucis Christi, qui terrena sapiunt, quorum Deus venter est. Hi non moribus corrigendis, sed negandis Fidei capitibus animum intendentes omnia miscebant, latiorem sibi aliisque muniebant licentiae viam, aut certe auctoritatem Ecclesiae ductumque defugientes, pro lubitu corruptissimi cuiusque principis populive, quasi imposito iugo, doctrinam eius, constitutionem, disciplinam in excidium petebant. Deinde, iniquorum imitati morem, ad quos pertinet comminatio: Vae qui dicitis malum bonum et bonum malum! rebellium tumultum et illam fidei morumque cladem appellarunt instaurationem, sese autem disciplinae veteris restitutores. Re tamen vera corruptores extiterunt, quod, extenuatis Europae per contentiones et bella viribus, defectiones horum temporum et secessiones maturarunt, quibus uno velut impetu facto triplex illud antea disiunctum dimicationis instauratum est genus, a quo invicta et sospes Ecclesia semper evaserat: hoc est, primae aetatis cruenta certamina; domesticam

**subipde pestem errorum; denique, per speciem, sacrae libertatis vindicandae, eam vitiorum luem ac disciplinae eversionem, ad quam fortasse nec aetas media processerat**." The Papist Berlin "Germania" thus translates the above passage, "And in these circumstances there arose proud and rebellious men, enemies of the cross of Christ, men of earthly mind, whose god was the belly. These, of course, did not set themselves to the improvement of morals, but to the denial of dogmas; they increased disorder and gave free rein to licentiousness for themselves and others, or at least, with contempt for the authoritative leadership of the Church, and in the wake of the passions of degenerate princes and peoples, they undermined with a certain tyranny the doctrine, constitution, and discipline of the Church. Then they imitated those ungodly men who are threatened: 'Woe to you who call good evil and evil good,' and called the rebellious confusion and perversity of faith and morals reform, and themselves reformers. But in truth they were seducers, and by exhausting the forces of Europe by quarrels and wars, they prepared the indignation and apostasy of modern times, in which the three kinds of struggle, formerly separate, and from which the Church always emerged victorious, have united into one: the bloody struggles of the first period, then the internal pestilence of heresies, at last, under the name of evangelical liberty, that depravity of morals and perversity of discipline to which perhaps the Middle Ages had not attained."

**Thus reviles the Papal See,** on which men have sat whom Ranke calls virtuosos of crime, the See which has made Rome a cesspool of all abominations and vices, and burned and murdered thousands of pious children of God, and raised up sheer countless heresies in the Church. And of his followers the hypocritical, infallible liar in Rome demands that they blindly believe his invectives in spite of all the facts, and consider the princes and theologians of the Reformation to be morally depraved men, and the Reformation itself to be the source of all insanities! Admittedly, as has already been remarked, some Papists, to whom the Pope's encyclical is quite inconvenient, have asserted that these outbursts of the "Holy Father" on the Reformers are of a historical nature, and are therefore not considered infallible by the Papists. But the "Chr. W." rightly writes: "Involuntarily one raises the question how far these words are spoken **ex cathedra** and participate in the declared infallibility of the pope. The purely historical material of the declaration would suffice; but of 'faith' and 'morals' it is nevertheless dealt with: should and must the whole Church now so believe and judge? Probably we will never get a clear answer from the Roman canonists about the dogmatic consequences of the encyclical. And Catholic politicians and journalists have no interest in clarifying this point. But the faithful people will make no distinction where their priests do not teach them this distinction. The whole force of the encyclical rests in its relation to infallibility. Just in these days (June 6) the spokesman of three hundred Berlin pilgrims addressed the Pope at an audience, as follows: We venerate in your exalted person the Vicar of Jesus.

Christ, the visible head of the universal Christian Catholic Church, the common father of shepherds and faithful, the infallible teacher of the nations, set by God, whose infallible magisterium delivers to us the words of eternal life." Nothing new, to be sure. The dogma of infallibility exists. But how far does it extend? At any rate, no Catholic may complain if solemn utterances of the Infallible are taken more severely by us Protestants than however polemical outbursts of single or many Protestant character, even of Protestant synods and ecclesiastical authorities, may ever be taken by anyone; for we are all at once consciously fallible, and have no other authority than that of the cause, which we either forfeit or gain."

**In the Prussian Chamber of Deputies, the** Pope's circular letter and the invective it contained were also examined and strongly condemned by various speakers, and the Reich Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg read out the following statement: "The encyclical contains judgments about the Reformation and the princes and peoples attached to it, which severely injure our Protestant population in their religious, governmental and moral feelings. These judgments, injurious also in form, explain the profound agitation of wide circles of the people, and involve a serious danger to the confessional peace. For this reason, immediately after receiving the official Latin text of the encyclical, I instructed our envoy to the Vatican to lodge an official complaint with the Curia and to express the expectation that the Curia would find ways and means to remedy the resulting damage. This expectation is all the more justified since, according to the ***Osservatore Romano,*** the Curia is not even in the remote vicinity of the Vatican.
has intended to offend the evangelical peoples and princes. The envoy has carried out my order. A final answer has not yet been given; it could not be given in view of the shortness of time. Therefore I must now abstain from further remarks. But it seemed to me necessary, in view of the agitation of the whole country, to answer the interpellations now. The Government is determined, in the general interest, to do its utmost to preserve and protect the confessional peace." In the caveat which the Prussian envoy filed with the Vatican against the encyclical, it is stated, "The responsibility for disturbances of the confessional peace rests solely with the body from which disturbances emanated. The Prussian Government, which in the interest of good relations between Church and State maintains a legation to the Papal See, believes it can say this with all the greater justification, as it itself strives by all means to preserve peace."

**In response to these ideas of the Prussian government,** Merry del Val, in true papist fashion, retreated and published in the ***Osservatore Romano the*** following statement, as cowardly as it was cunning: "In view of the agitation that has come to light in Germany because of erroneous interpretations and inaccurate translations of the Pope's last encyclical, we are authorized to declare: The Holy Father, in the encyclical published on the occasion of the feast day of St. Borromeo, and which was intended to combat the errors of fashion, of the modernists, as is also evident from the word

According to the encyclical, St. Borromeo did not have the slightest intention of offending the non-Catholics of Germany or their princes. In the encyclical there are only some historical judgments about the epoch of St. Borromeo, in which neither peoples nor princes of a particular country are mentioned. For the rest, it is to be noted that in it are Catholics of that period (the sixteenth century) who rebelled against the doctrines and authority of the Apostolic See." At the same time, Merry del Val assured that he had already instructed the. German bishops to refrain from reading the encyclical from the pulpit and otherwise publishing it. Nor had the "Holy Father" ever missed an opportunity to express his sympathy for the German nation and the German princes. After all, Pius X had recently, at the reception of a German pilgrimage, expressly blessed the German people and the German Emperor! Thus the sophistical Pope seeks to pretend his way out of trouble by cunning diplomacy, without retracting his lies. But he has not got away without a black eye, any more than he did in the Fairbanks and Roosevelt affairs.

**With reference to the moral back-down of the Pope,** the "Chr. W." writes: "Of the yielding of the Curia one can only say, as a theologian, jurist, and historian, that it signifies a historically strange event in view of its claims. One has often called the abuse of the Reformation 'unheard of'; this is only in a small measure true; one can rather call the retreat of the Curia 'unheard of'. Against all attempts to cover it up, let us hold fast what is clearly before us as a fact." The "A. E. L. K." writes: "The Vatican's reply to the Prussian envoy's ideas has been made, and signifies a decided success on the part of the Prime Minister von Bethmann-Hollweg. The law teacher Prof. Dr. Kahl also points out in the "Tägl. Rundschau' the greatness of the success, which can only be appreciated by those who know the history of the relationship between the State and the Curia. The Prime Minister, wisely limiting himself to what was achievable, had instructed the envoy in Rome to express to the papal Curia the "definite" expectation "that it would find ways and means suitable to eliminate as far as possible the damage resulting from the publication of the encyclical; in particular, we would have to expect that the encyclical would neither be proclaimed from the pulpit in the German dioceses nor published in the episcopal ordinances". On June 11 it was officially explained to the envoy that the Pope had already given orders to the German bishops to refrain from such promulgation and publication. On June 13 the Curia sent the following note to the Envoy, signed by the Cardinal Secretary of State: "The undersigned Cardinal Secretary of State has the honor to acknowledge to His Excellency the receipt of the note of June 8 from the Prussian Envoy concerning the agitation which has arisen among the Prussian population after the publication of the encyclical "Lckitas 8L6P6". The Holy See believes that the origin of this agitation is due to the fact that the purpose to which the Encyclical was directed has not been correctly discerned, and that, consequently, some of its sentences have been interpreted in a sense entirely foreign to the intentions of the Holy Father. It is therefore incumbent upon the undersigned Cardinal to state that His Holiness, with true

The Holy Father has never missed an opportunity to express his sincere respect and sympathy for Germany's nations and princes, and on a recent occasion has had the pleasure of repeating his sentiments. The Holy Father, moreover, has never passed by an opportunity of expressing his sincere respect and sympathy for Germany's nations and princes, and on a recent occasion still had the pleasure of repeating these sentiments. The undersigned Cardinal avails himself of this opportunity to renew to Sr. Excellency the expression of his excellent esteem.' " This **back-down of** Pius X. recalls the withdrawal of Pius IX. in 1870, of which the "D. E. K." writes: "In the pamphlet by Geh. Rat Dr. Mirbt in Marburg 'Die preußische Gesandtschaft am Hof des Papstes' (Verlag des Ev. Bund) one reads: 'When at the Vatican Council a submission was made to the synodals which called Protestantism a "plague," Bismarck had Cardinal Antonelli informed by the North German federal envoy von Arnim that if the confession of the King of Prussia and thereby he himself were officially offended, he would recall the envoy and call upon the Prussian bishops to return to their dioceses. On the spot the Curia withdrew the offending expression.'" The Vatican interpreters of the encyclical, of course, now declare in the ***Osservatore Romano*** and in other Roman papers, especially also in the centrist press: the Pope's concession to the German demands was only a form and a farce. The Pope had declared that he had not taken note of the general agitation in Germany "with regret" but with displeasure (**dispiacere**). And the official announcement of the encyclical, which would be omitted in Germany, had no canonical value at all, because the document had already been published in all legal forms for the whole Catholic world. But such and similar Jesuit declarations do not diminish the defeat of the pope, but only document the old Welsh falsehood and mendacity of the papal church.

**Of the numerous protests** against the Pope's encyclical, we leave several to follow. The Executive Board of the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference issued the following "statement": "The papal statement in the Borromeo Encyclical has caused deep and serious concern throughout evangelical Christianity. We, too, would feel that we were neglecting our duty if we did not protest in the name of the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference, dispassionately but with unreserved, holy earnestness, against the ignominy done to the Reformation. Like all knowledgeable people, we knew in any case that Papal Rome cannot cease to be the mortal enemy of the Gospel in the sense of the Reformation, but we were not prepared for such an unmotivated outbreak of this enmity. We do not deplore it both for the sake of evangelical Christianity - it can only gain from such an attack - but we deplore it in the interests of the Catholic Church, the common cause of Christ, confessional peace and national unity. We do not yet give up the hope that even in the Catholic Church itself all those who formerly expressed an earnest desire for understanding and rapprochement will even now, in rejecting and resisting

will join with us in this regrettable disturbance of mutual recognition. We ask all our members, however, to take this regrettable event as a new occasion to rally around the cause of the Gospel with wholehearted devotion and to strive ever more earnestly to ensure that Luther's legacy is given the position it deserves in the spiritual life of the present day. The German members of the General Council of the Lutheran Church are not only members of the Lutheran Church, but also members of the Lutheran Church. The German members of the Executive Board of the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference: D. Ihmels, chairman; D. Bard, vice-chairman; Hübener, secretary; D. Braune; D. Hölscher; D. Hoppe; D. Th. Kaftan; Petersen; D. Walther; D. Th. Zahn."

**The Oberkonsistorium in Bavaria** has sent the following "church address", probably written by D. v. Bezzel, for reading in the pulpits: "Dear fellow believers! Mindful of our duty to open our mouths for the dumb and to defend those who, removed from the fray, can no longer defend themselves against attacks, and even more out of heartfelt gratitude for our fathers and teachers who have told us the Word of God, we must address to you a word of brotherly admonition and strengthening, sincerely pleased to feel completely at one with you here. You all know what heavy reproaches have been brought against our spiritual fathers and their work in recent times, as if the work of the Reformation - richly blessed by the Lord in spite of all its shortcomings and shadows - had done harm to the Church of Christ and weakened, even destroyed, its serious sanctification! Enemies of the cross of Christ, men of earthly sense, are called those from whose hands we have received and seen the most glorious praise of the act of redemption, from whose lives we have seen the great earnestness of following Christ. Truly, if Luther had only given us the explanation of the Catechism, whose writer that monk called a 'blessed and holy man,' and if the whole movement of the sixteenth century had only left us the hymn, with its imperishable sounds, with its sages embracing heaven and earth in praise, longing, and adoration, we should be rich and blessed people! But who can measure all the blessings that have flowed from the lives of these dear men, the streams of living water that flow from those who, believing in Jesus Christ, their only Saviour, have borne witness to him in life, suffering and death? He who touches our fathers touches the apple of our eye, and makes it difficult for us to raise to constant prayer the heartfelt desire for the final unity of all who know Christ under the one and eternal Shepherd. But we do not want to defend ourselves against the grave injustice with words and flaming protests, but with serious zeal we want to grasp the threatened goods of salvation, and with loving faithfulness we want to immerse ourselves in the Holy Scriptures, which Luther has let speak to us in the mother tongue so full-toned and overpowering, to the Saviour, whose cross is our victory and whose intercession is our consolation, to stand in manly loyalty, to incite us to compete in the work of faith, in the fulfilment of our vocation, this great thanksgiving for supernatural benefits, to compete finally in true world-embracing love. We ask Almighty God to grant a peaceful fruit of righteousness out of the afflictive events of the past months and weeks, to unite us and keep us in unity of spirit, so that as true sons of our unforgettable fathers, we may not only keep their graves, but also our lives.

adorn themselves, but follow their faith full of their spirit, and at last attain the end longed for by all Christians, namely, the blessedness of souls."

**The German Protestant Church Committee** has thus let itself be heard: "Berlin, June 10. Through the public papers, grave denigrations and disparagements have become known which Pope Pius X, in the encyclical issued on the tercentenary of the canonization of Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, has taken occasion to pronounce against the Reformers, the work of the Reformation, and the princes and peoples who participated in it. The German Protestant Church Committee not only considers it its inalienable right, but also regards it as its indispensable duty, in the name of the German Protestant regional churches united in it, to reject with full determination this attack against the Protestant Church, which is not justified by anything. It is true that similar attacks are not new. They have appeared many times in scholarly as well as popular writings, without any other defense seeming necessary than the correction which historical truth brings about of its own accord. But it is a different matter when, as was recently done in the Canisius Encyclical of August 1, 1897, and is now repeated here in a still sharper and more hurtful manner, the head of the Roman Catholic Church himself takes the floor. With the full force of supreme ecclesiastical authority assertions are here uttered which must mislead the uninformed by a conspicuous and extensive lack of historical insight. And not only this, but by the disparaging judgment of the great deeds of the Reformation, on which our Protestant Church rests, and which our Protestant people preserve among its most sacred memories, both Church and people are deeply injured, and the peaceful understanding of the denominations is seriously disturbed. By demanding freedom of conscience as a possession gained through the Reformation, we respect every religious conviction that is sacred to others, and reject every form of struggle that lacks this respect. For the sake of our German people as well as for the sake of the Gospel, we strive to transform the unavoidable antagonism of the denominations into a holy competition of the struggle for eternal truth in order to unfold and demonstrate the powers of love resolved in it. In this the Protestant Church sees the only way to the peace of the confessions which is indispensable for our fatherland. For this very reason, however, we cannot but speak out with sacred earnestness of truth in the name of the regional churches of Germany united in the German Protestant Church Committee: We reject the unfounded vituperation of our Reformers, whose high and consecrated figures our Protestant people will never cease to revere and uphold as pioneers and fathers of its faith. We reject the denigration of their work, through which the evangelical people are conscious of having found the one High Priest Christ and the way to salvation, freedom from all human statutes, and the Word of God accessible to all. Finally, we reject the moral disparagement of the princes and peoples who became the bearers of the Reformation movement, and whose descendants to this day have given full proof of the spiritual, moral, and cultural forces that were released by that movement and became effective among them. Even before

A few days ago, as representatives of the German Protestant churches, we confessed the Gospel of the Reformation in an uplifting service in the chapel of Wartburg Castle. With this confession of the work of the Reformation and its bearers, we repeat in unity with the entire Protestant Church anew the confession of the biblical gospel, which they have saved for us as an everlasting good, and of the Saviour of whom Luther sings: 'He must keep the field!" German Protestant Church Committee."

**At the protest meeting on June 21 in liberal Bremen,** "A Reply to Rome" was also adopted, which thus reads: "In the Borromeo encyclical, the fathers of Protestantism and the evangelical princes and peoples are utterly denigrated. With heartfelt unanimity, Protestant Germans of all tribes and estates have stood up for the good right of Protestant faith and Protestant liberty, and have opposed the historical truth to the false judgment of Rome. The success is that the encyclical is not officially published in Germany where it has not already been. Shall this remain the only fruit of the holy agitation which has trembled through us during the last weeks? We wish that a permanent memorial be created to this uprising of the German Protestant people. If Rome meant to revile the Protestant Church for the greater glory of Borromeo, we want to promote the Protestant Church for the greater glory of God. If Borromeo was zealous that Catholic schools, Sunday schools, and seminaries should be founded, we want to work so that wherever Protestants live in Catholic surroundings, the youth will be filled with a powerful Protestant consciousness through Protestant schools and educational institutions. So let this be our answer to Rome, that we establish a Protest Fund 1910 for the preservation and promotion of German Protestant educational institutions in Catholic countries and provinces! Let us go then, Protestant Germans of all districts and countries! Let us respond to Rome not with protests and resolutions alone, but with a great deed! Do as you did two years ago! Then you would have been at the head of those who filled Count Zeppelin's hands for the conquest of the air. Fill our hands, that we may conquer air and light for the evangelical youth endangered by Roman surroundings!"

**Although the above and similar protests,** which the invectives of the Pope have provoked in Protestant Germany, are also pleasing to us, they lack the genuine Lutheran, old Protestant sound. Had Luther penned them, they would have turned out quite differently. "The papacy at Rome, instituted by the devil," should be the dominant theme in all protests against Rome. But who still believes in the present spineless Protestant world that the Pope is the right, true Antichrist? To be sure, people still occasionally rail against the insolence of "**Dago on the Tiber,**" but there is little or nothing left of the holy hatred and anger against the antichrist Roman Curia and its blasphemy of the holy Gospel, even among many Lutherans. The protesters in Bremen exhorted, "No hatred against the Pope!" The "Reformation": yes, not to polemicize too vehemently against the encyclical, lest it damage other social interests! "Peace between the denominations can only come about where people are willing to

not only invective against one another." "In evangelical Christianity it shall not resound out of the forest as it has resounded into it." (As if these were only coarse expressions! F. B.) "And we do not want to be taken in tow now by fanatics, such as there are also among the Protestants. Cooperation with the Catholics in the social and national field must be saved through these difficult times; the Christian-national workers' movement must survive this test of endurance without damage. May it be difficult to speak irenically instead of polemically in these days - I continue to fight for the brotherhood in arms of the Protestants and the Catholics in the Christian-national labor movement." It is obvious that such Protestants have little more idea that the Pope is the mortal enemy of the Church and the State. In many cases such Protestants regard the invectives of the pope as mere aberrations which the pope himself does not take so seriously. They have not recognized that it is not a mere accident, but that it is in the nature of the papacy to blaspheme and persecute the Gospel and its confessors. If it no longer wished to do so, it would have to give itself up. What is true of the Jesuits is also true of the popes: **Sint ut sunt, aut non sint**. The Pope must remain a liar and murderer in the Church, or cease to be. Even papist papers have pointed out that Pius X is only repeating what many other popes before him have done, and what flows naturally from the position that every pope occupies. If, therefore, the indignation over the Borromeo encyclical should in any way promote this realization that the Pope, by his very nature, can only ever slander, curse, and persecute the Gospel and its confessors, the gain would be great, and God would once again have made good what the Pope intended to make bad. F. B.

**The "A. E. L. K." reports from Saxony:** "Enthusiastic homage is being paid to the king throughout the country on the occasion of the firm word he has spoken against the Borromeo encyclical, which the one-hour audience the bishop had with him will not have changed. At least the king gladly accepted the official homage in Dresden on his return from a journey, where a crowd numbering in the thousands, including delegations from the guilds, the political associations, the teachers, the civil servants, the university, the art academy and all the military associations. The King replied to the speech that the matter had been rather difficult for him, which everyone will gladly believe. The gratitude of the Saxon people is all the greater. The State Consistory has announced the report of the King's intervention in the Ordinance Gazette, and has ordered that it be made known to the municipalities as soon as possible."

**Impressionism, individualism and historicism,** these are the basic damages of liberal theology according to the "circular letter" that invited to the theological conference in Nuremberg. The "Circular" says: "Impressionism neutralizes the objective knowledge value and truth content of Christianity and puts religious moods and impressive experiences in its place. Individualism isolates the individual and detaches him from social ecclesiastical obligation. The histo-

rism, in its consistent excesses, leads not only to the denial of the absoluteness of Christianity, but to the elimination of its historical foundations altogether, and makes the historical revelation in Christ a development of ideas for which there are no barriers. There are no limits. All three directions rob the Church of the possibility of fulfilling her world task as the bearer of a, firm possession of truth." Their ultimate ground is in subjectivism, which places the Christian ego and one's own experience beside and above Holy Scripture. F. B.

**In Baden the Simultanschule with its non-denominational religious instruction has** been generally introduced since 1876. However, none of the prophecies with which liberalism accompanied its introduction has come true. Confessional peace has not come, Rome's power has not been broken, but has grown stronger. Liberalism, which had thought to secure itself for ever by the Simultanschule, has lost its appeal and power; Social Democracy has risen to prominence. In spite of the legal existence of the Simultanschule, nevertheless, 66 per cent of all schools have denominationally unmixed pupils, only 34 per cent are mixed. Of that 34 percent, 24.9 percent have more than students of a single denomination. Nevertheless, at the beginning of this year, Social Democracy and National Liberalism moved and unanimously voted for the elimination of the three remaining denominational teachers' seminaries. State minister Freiherr v. Dusch declared in this connection: The Government reserved its position on the matter. "The motion amounts to saying that religious instruction in the schools should no longer be given by the teachers. An elimination of religious instruction is not to be expected." The National Liberal Rebmann replied that this was not the opinion of the motion; "the Church would then give the religious instruction, and that would have consequences which we do not want." - Concerning the forcing of teachers to give religious instruction against their convictions, G. v. Dusch stated, "No one is forced to enter the elementary school teaching profession. Entry into this profession is purely voluntary, and it is known to the parents of the young people who enter the teaching profession that their sons will also be obliged in the future to give religious instruction." The monthly bulletins of the Association for the Preservation of the Protestant Elementary School note: "Thus all accusations of compulsion of conscience and of 'gruesome obligation' were rejected. What, then, can the state do when someone forces himself into an office that imposes obligations on him which, according to his inner position, he cannot fulfill? Or is it the fault of the State if someone, while in office, loses the external or internal ability to hold that office properly? Stop, then, making the State the scapegoat for things for which it is in no way to blame!" (A. E. L. K.)

**Liberalism in Baden.** A letter from Baden to the "Reichsbote" makes a lively complaint about the fact that recently a position in the theological faculty in Heidelberg has again been filled by a liberal. It reproaches the government for this and recalls that "ecclesiastical liberalism showed its ultimate intention last summer in the General Synod by its determined action against Apostolicism, and after various members of the theological faculty agreed with the Great Bloc policy.

Explained". The letter goes on to say, among other things: "Pros. Trölsch of Heidelberg made a strong impression at a meeting of the Evangelical League in Mannheim last summer when he exclaimed with great pathos: We Protestants actually no longer had a common bond of faith, we had only one characteristic in common, that we were not Catholics; but that could not replace the lack of a bond of faith, and if we did not find such a bond of faith again, then one would soon be able to erase Protestantism from public life. One could hardly illuminate the situation of the Protestant Church more glaringly." The Minister of Worship and Education treated liberalism as the sole right.

The "A. E. L. K." writes of **the increasing modern paganism in Germany**: "As harsh as it may sound, the truth requires the harsh word: the influence of the Gospel on our people is in progressive decline. The last year has again thrown glaring lights upon it. We are already so accustomed to the crumbling that one is hardly shocked any more by the news that the number of people leaving the church has increased again this year, that in the large cities the number of people taking communion is sinking inexorably, that the alienation from the church has taken on unheard-of dimensions. The alienation from the church is increasing both upward and downward. It is well known that the so-called fourth estate does not want to know anything about the church, that the Social Democracy virtually unfolds a police system over its members and formally harasses those who are still willing to go to church out of the church. Less attention is paid to the fact that the educated classes are also withdrawing en masse from the church, not only from the services of faithful preachers of Christ, but also from those of the moderns, who, after all, were making an effort to attract the people again by more 'up-to-date' and 'unoffensive' sermons. They no longer want to hear anything, at least not in church; a formal church addiction has taken hold. . . . What kind of physiognomy will the next generation show?" In Berlin in particular, the number of people leaving the national church is increasing at an alarming rate: a fruit of liberal theology and the cowardice and false love of peace of the positives.
F. B.

**The Bremen Protestant Association** rejected a discussion with the notorious D. Drews, who denies the historical existence of Jesus, on the following grounds: "All the theologians of the Bremen Protestant Association agree that the question whether Jesus lived is not a religious question as such, but a historical-scientific question. It would also be a bad state of affairs for Christianity as a religion if its power to exist depended on the question whether anyone had lived in former times or whether anything had happened in former times, and if it were a question of the greatest person and the most important event. Every true religion does not live on 'accidental historical truths,' but on 'eternal truths of reason;' it does not live on its more or less ascertainable past, which always lies in the field of dispute of historical science, but it lives on the living forces which it daily releases anew into souls from the depths of immediacy. Up to the present day, however, Christianity, as the filiation of God, has again and again released into humanity the greatest and noblest fundamental forces of the soul, and again: the great

The most important thing is the trust in the ruling Deity Himself, the highest moral self-respect, and that true love of one's neighbour which, whatever it demands of the other, is always ready to grant him in its turn. What other and now even 'philosophical' religions have to show to-day, and have been brought into various systems, can neither come into question as a popular religion, nor have they any deeper religious and moral forces to show than those very Christian ones. All these noblest religious forces of Christianity are, however, in the last analysis quite independent of the question whether Jesus lived, and therefore we can hand over this question, however it is finally answered, with all calmness and objectivity to the forum before which alone it belongs. This forum, however, is under no circumstances the popular assembly, but, as should be natural among serious intellectual workers, professional criticism, historical scholarship, the congress of scholars." Christ attaches blessedness to his person and to his historical work, when, for instance, he declares to 'the Jews, "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."' But of the doctrine that salvation is to be found in the name of JEsu alone, the Protestant Unificationists want to know nothing. In Japan this is called Japaneseized Christianity.

F. B.

**The "Philadelphia", the organ of the community people,** writes about the "Pentecostal movement": "The waves of the movement still run high. Like a dividing wedge it penetrates into old and new community circles. It is an obvious fact that it has brought a deep division into the German community circles. . . . A concomitant of the Pentecostal movement are the messages. These are supposed to be prophecies in the name of God. The leaders of the movement themselves admit that some of these messages have so far proved to be false. They offer all kinds of excuses and explanations for this, some of them quite weak; but they do not want to see that a false spirit is at play in the movement itself. . . . Healing and other miracles are by no means a sure proof of the divinity of a movement. For the Lord Himself says of the 'last days' that in them false prophets will appear with signs and wonders, and that even the elect will be deceived into error wherever possible. . . . It is striking to us that a considerable number of such persons, who have already caused trouble, worry and difficulties for the community leaders by their agitated, restless, often also insubordinate and reckless nature, are now entering the Pentecostal movement with full sails. Even more so, persons from whom faithful and discerning brethren have had to part because their dishonesty or arrogance or lust for power had become apparent, now roam the country as representatives of the Pentecostal movement. With them, at any rate, there is nothing of the spirit that exposes and casts out the impure. Even hysterical and nervously excited people are rushing headlong into the movement. It is to be feared that the nerves of such sick people, even if they seem to be cured for a time, will be completely ruined by the excitement connected with this movement. Thus we were told these days of a brother who had also taken part in the Mühlheim Pentecostal Conference and had been very enthusiastic there, but now had to be taken to the lunatic asylum. It is to be feared at last that the spirit of the Pentecostal movement will also

will destroy the last need for ecclesiastical fellowship and lead to complete separation from the Church."

As reported in the "Liebenwerdaer Kreisblatt", General Superintendent Stolte told about **the religious position of the German Emperor** during a church visitation in Schirmenitz (district of Torgau): In a conversation with him the Kaiser had expressed: I often and gladly read in the Bible which lies on my bedside table and in which I have underlined the most delicious thoughts. I cannot understand why there are so many people who occupy themselves so little with the Word of God. Who, when reading the Gospels and other passages, is not under the impression of plain, experienced, authenticated, and testified truth? How else could Christ have expressed the imprint of the world! In everything I think and do, I ask myself what the Bible has to say about it. It is my source, from which I draw strength and light. In hours of trembling and fear I reach for this treasure of consolation. I am confident that many people who have fallen away from God will regain a firm faith in our time, that many will again feel a longing for God. It is the beautiful and joyful thing in the Christian Church that times of strong doubt awaken a special courage of confession and an enthusiastic joy of faith. I cannot imagine a life that is inwardly alienated from God. We all have to go through hours of Gethsemane, hours when our pride is humbled. Humility is difficult for us, we want to be our own master.

**Concerning corporal punishment in elementary schools**, the Prussian Minister of Education has published the following decree: "1. the right of corporal punishment should not be taken away from the teacher. It must be a matter of honor for the teacher to keep the use of corporal punishment in his school to a minimum. 3. abuse of the right of corporal punishment betrays a lack of pedagogical training. 4. corporal punishment is not a suitable means of promoting learning. 5. corporal punishment should never be used without first considering the possible influence of domestic and physiological conditions on the pupil's behaviour. 6. corporal punishment must not be used in such a way as to harm the health of the pupil, to damage his honour or to offend his sense of shame. (7) Excessive use of the right of corporal punishment not infrequently leads to the limits of the court, even if it is done only in zeal, excitement, or indignation. (8) For the protection not only of the pupils, but also of his own pedagogical dignity, the teacher should therefore observe everything that makes it difficult to act in the heat of the moment. (9) In particular, it is always advisable to remain at a reasonable distance from the pupil. (10) The most effective means of reducing the occasions for the use of punishment are conscientious preparation, stimulating instruction, strict self-restraint."

**In France, since the separation of the church from the state,** the clergy **must be** maintained by the "Kultuspfennig," and its obligations are all the greater, since now the old-age pensions will no longer be paid by the state from this year on. Consequently, for example, the burdens of the bishopric of Albi increase by 130,000 francs, those of the bishopric of Mans by 75,000 francs. The Bishop of Mans explains to his parishioners that the parishes are threatened "to disappear one after the other in a relatively short time". "We regret

have to acknowledge that the penny of worship is decreasing from year to year, and we do not look to the future without great anxiety." In the Archbishopric of AM, where the Archbishop has renounced all salary for himself, the salaries of the parish priests had to be reduced to about twelve per cent against the Concordat salary, and some parishes were merged. Parishes were also divided into three classes: richer, middle, and poorer, so that the rich might help the poor. The diocese of Tarentaise, the poorest of all, received before the separation a State subsidy of 135,000 francs, which is now paid, reduced to 81,000 francs, by the faithful at 1.50 francs per head. Where the faithful do not pay a penny of worship, the ringing of bells, the singing, the music, the oration are omitted at weddings, the ringing at baptisms, the ringing at funerals; a priest only officiates, the coffin is not collected in the heap.

(A. E. L. K.)

**There is a great shortage of priests in France**. The gaps caused by death can no longer be filled. In one parish 56 parishes have already been added to others. The increase in seminarians is also small. A prelate said that this shortage is the result of the laws on education, religious orders, separation of church and state, compulsory military service of the clergy, and also of public opinion, which considers "the priesthood to be out of fashion. Hardly one fifth of the population goes to Mass. Also the priests no longer had a good living. The donations also of the wealthy Catholics were extremely small. But those who do not pay cannot count on the ringing of bells at baptisms, the decoration of the church, singing, music and speeches at weddings and the ringing of bells and singing at the grave. F. B.

**In France, moral degradation is making** uncanny progress in all fields. ***L'Echo de Paris*** states that the number of Apaches, street bandits in Paris and its environs, who have been educated to this "profession," certainly reaches 100,000. The majority are not yet twenty years of age. While some begin the new profession immediately by murder, most prepare for their future by petty crimes and theft, burglaries, armed violence. Recently in the neighbourhood of Argenteuil such a gang was discovered by the police. In the open street the members of the gang, revolver in hand, stopped the citizens and demanded their money. The criminals were all between the ages of only fifteen and sixteen. As is evident from the ***Officiel***, which publishes the criminal statistics, the number of criminals has doubled in the last twenty years: in 1908 there were no less than 556,000 of them. Murders have also increased in the same proportion. In the years 1891 to 1895 there was an average of 171 of them annually; in the period from 1896 to 1900 there were 176 murders annually; in 1907 there were no less than 332 of them, and in 1908 318. The attacks of the Apaches upon the police are also increasing from year to year, a proof of their growing boldness. Recently an Apache even seriously wounded four policemen; two of whom have succumbed to their injuries. The Apache had his arms wrapped under his overcoat with spiked straps. When the policemen tried to grab him by the arms, they let go in horror, their hands bleeding from many stab wounds.

and incapacitated. After the arrest, the Apache, himself badly wounded, declared in the hospital that he was very pleased to have killed at least one policeman; he wished to murder them all. A liberal Parisian newspaper rightly asked what would become of society once this army of 100,000 beasts was unleashed upon it.

**New fervour in Wales.** The so-called Wales Movement has passed away, and the membership of the Free Churches in Wales has returned to its former level, and in some cases even below it. Now a new movement seems to be preparing in Sunderland (near Newcastle), in connection with the meeting of the International Religious Convention. Characteristics are the belief in prayer healing and raising the dead, in the imminent coming of the millennial kingdom, and speaking in tongues. Epileptic fits at the meetings are regarded as something natural. The real promoters of this movement are Welch miners, but the leader is an Anglican vicar, Rev. A. A. Boddy, and two Germans, Fr. Niblock (?) and Fr. Paul, also stand out. The former remarked in an address, "Every morning I fill myself with the Spirit of God till my nerves tingle; so no harm can come to me," and Fr. Paul told of his own experiences, "When I was baptized myself, the electric current from heaven passed through my whole being; it was of such force that I could not stay on my knees, and felt as if I were being torn to pieces." Various miraculous cures of rheumatism, chronic neuralgia, and paralysis are reported, and the meetings, which were numerously attended, seem to have been carried on by a great enthusiasm. (A. E. L. K.)

**In Russia the Ministry of the Interior has** collected as exact data as possible on all registered cases of "apostasy" for the period from October 17, 1905 (enactment of the Edict of Toleration) to May 1, 1909. 233,000 have "fallen away" from Roman Catholicism in Poland and 62,000 in the nine western governorates. 14,500 persons are recorded as having fallen away from Lutheranism, of whom 12,000 are in the Baltic provinces. 50,000 have converted to Mohammedanism, almost exclusively in the six eastern governorates of European Russia. There are also 3400 known cases of conversion to Buddhism, 400 to Judaism, and about 150 to paganism in Siberia. Almost all of these conversions took place immediately after the publication of the imperial decree on religious freedom.

**Japaneseized Christianity. In** Japan there are plans for a new, dogma-free and churchless Christianity. In a lecture, a teacher at the Methodist Seminary in Tokyo said, "The Christianity of the future in this country will be a mixture of Western and Eastern ideas, of Buddhist, Confucian, and Christian elements." Another professor, who is a member of a Christian church and also calls himself a Confucianist and a Buddhist, writes: "We wish religious people of different faiths to respect each other and worship back and forth in their sacred buildings. We wish to put Amens and Hallelujahs into the mouths of Buddhist monks and teach Christians to pray in Buddhist temples. The absurd idea which has so long dominated the countries of the West, that Christians alone are civilized

and enlightened, and that all non-Christian nations are no better than barbarians, is gone once for all. Protestantism may in some respects stand somewhat higher than Catholicism; but neither of these two forms of Christianity is fit to bring the world under its dominion." In the ***Japan Chronicle,*** the leader of the movement for

Christianity outside the churches: "There is a Christianity outside the churches in Japan, and it is stronger than missionaries think. The Western idea that a religion must present itself in an organized form before it can even be recognized as a religion is foreign to the Japanese mind. To us religion is more a family than a national or social affair, as can be clearly seen from the strong hold that Confucianism has exercised over us without assuming organized social forms. It is my firm conviction that Christianity will now take the place of Confucianism as the family religion of the Japanese. And as a family religion it needs no fixed dogmas or ceremonies performed by church servants. This new form of Christianity that my countrymen have adopted is neither orthodox nor Unitarian. We go directly to Jesus of Nazareth, and our goal is to live like him and be made like him. And because we have him as our ideal, we hate 'demonstrations' of all kinds, and abhor a conference which calls for greetings from a prince, an earl, a baron, and a mayor. And I am convinced that, in stating such things, I give expression to the feeling of many, known and unknown to me, who are disciples of Christ without being in any connection with so-called churches." If Christianity is Japaneseized, Anglicized, Germanized, or Americanized, it is dechristianized every time. The Gospel of Christ becomes morality according to Christ. The movements in Japan are fruits of liberal theology in Europe. F. B.

**Simplizissimus, Ulk and other German joke papers.** The Kölnische Zeitung writes: "The unpleasant consequences of the increasingly crude political caricatures of some of our joke papers have already been repeatedly pointed out, especially how they damage the cause of Germanness abroad. We Germans in general are already so unpopular abroad that our journals really had no need to make us even more enemies. The damage they do, however, is not only in the political field, but they also discredit German writing. Abroad, the opinion is often spread that our journals are written by the most critical and witty people. Whoever proceeds on this assumption must, when he sees, for instance, the crude and beyond all terms tasteless pamphlets which are now being published in some papers about the King of Spain, acquire a very low conception indeed of German wit and German spirit. It is not only the viciousness and crudity of these caricatures that repels, but in almost a higher degree their tastelessness and the fact that wit and satire are more and more replaced by clumsy crudity and a certain uncleanliness. If widespread joke sheets continue to substitute only ugliness and coarse insults for wit and humour, the result is an inferior typeface which finally has neither artistic nor humorous value.

and can be regarded merely as an indication of a lack of social education and brutalization, which disparages German writing at home and abroad in an undeserved manner."

**The deceased criminal psychologist Lombroso**, who wanted all criminals to be treated only as sick people, has been celebrated for decades, especially by the materialists, as a particularly great light of science. But the Berliner Tageblatt tells the following story about his "science": "In 1888, Lombroso approached Goron, then head of the security police, with a written request to send him photographs of Parisian women criminals for a work entitled 'Die Frau als Verbrecherin' ('Woman as Criminal'). Lombroso then annotated the reproduced images on more than 60 pages. In a lengthy omission, Lombroso had pointed out in each photograph how one face showed the typical features of the female criminal out of passion, another the characteristic signs of the female criminal under the influence of alcohol. So far the matter was all right, and the book would have been very interesting and instructive, had not Mr. Goron suddenly made a fatal discovery. For when he looked closely at the pictures, he realized that he, for his part, had made a mistake in the drawer of his desk. Instead of the left-hand drawer, he had pulled open the right-hand one, and had forwarded to Lombroso, not photographs of criminals, but of harmless tradeswomen and saleswomen, who, enclosing their likenesses, had applied to the police for the concession!" Lombrofo's sense of honesty, however, did not go so far as to admit publicly his error, and to call what he passed off as the result of science a hoax and conceit. Lombrofo, like Häckel, was rather a blot than an ornament and a beacon of science. His intellectual and scientific ineptitude also appears from the fact that he finally threw himself into the arms of the delusion of spiritualism. The "G. d. G." writes p. 469: "A certain press seems to be very interested in obscuring the fact that C. Lombroso was a spiritualist of the most fantastic kind. He is said to have possessed only a scientific interest in it. In this direction there are, for example, several statements in the 'Franks. Ztg.' several statements move in this direction. In contrast to this are the following statements by the Roman correspondent of the 'Berl. Tagebl.', H. Barth, which are certainly an impeccable source: 'The more he occupied himself - like his friend Prof. Morselli, the famous psychiatrist of Genoa - with those mysterious things, the more he became enmeshed by them and in them, and finally he openly converted to Spiritism, to which he dedicated a larger work. Years ago, when I visited the professor in his villa at Turin, the little old gentleman himself climbed a ladder up his library shelves and brought down two large, round plaster relics: two hideously distorted grimaces, with almost nothing human about them.' They were, Lombroso explained to me, the facial casts of materialized phantoms!' That's as high as 'science' ever gets." And that Lombroso's materialistic theory of crime was all bogus, he made himself the living proof of it. The "G. d. G." writes further: "The deceased psychiatrist sought his 'criminal type' not only in some other signs of degeneration but above all in

in a small, retarded or atrophied brain. We've always fought that fallacy. Now he has taken his own revenge on Lombroso. In a testamentary disposition he designated his own brain as the object of scientific investigation. A strange discovery was made: it weighed only 1303 grams, less than the brain of the average European. To be thus struck on the head in death by one's own bold assertions! His followers now have the choice of either taking their devoutly revered capacity and beacon of science as intellectually inferior or letting his untenable theories ride." Thus Lombroso himself has seen to it that his science is irrefutably pilloried as a fraud. Yes, it is easy for our God to make a mockery of the toil and life's work of the ungodly and to make a mockery of their memory. The "G. d. G." reports: "Incidentally, it is telegraphed from Rome that the Spiritists in Italy were certainly expecting an early manifestation of the spirit of Lornbroso, for the deceased had firmly promised to contact the secretary of the Society for Psychiatric Research in Milan, of which he was a member, as soon as possible after his death. He would make use, if at all possible, of the well-known medium Euspasia Palladino, with whom he had been experimenting since 1895. Should not the medium do well to communicate the above fact to Lombroso's mind, lest he experience the same incursions as a spiritualist as a materialist? Too late! For, as is reported from England, Lombroso has already contacted the apostle of peace, Stead, and revealed to him in English all sorts of nonsense! What confused, contradictory apparitions are these modern spirits who arrogate to themselves the leadership of the times! Their so-called world-view is mostly a confused chaos." Worthy end of a lying science!

F. B.

The "Orientalische Literaturzeitung" writes of **German scholarship**: "It is in the nature of German scholarship that such discussions" (as, for example, on Panbabylonism) "can never be conducted objectively and with sole regard for the progress of science. This is opposed by the formation of schools within the German scholarly world, which tempts one to hold fast to the main doctrines of the school represented and to reject every new view, 1. because it contradicts the school opinion - which must be correct - 2. because one does not know it and its foundations sufficiently." In any case, a bad censure for the much-vaunted German science.

"**Masonic religion** is the relation in which the individual Brother stands to the Original Source of all things, to the working World Principle, expressed in the language of our Covenant, to the 'Almighty Builder of all worlds.' For his religious views he is responsible to no one but his own conscience. How he stands by the forms, dogmas and doctrines of this or that Church is of no importance to Freemasonry. It demands only that he be a morally good man and that he prove by his actions that genuine human love dwells in his heart." Thus reads a letter which two members of the Osnabrück Masonic Lodge addressed to the National Grand Master "Brother" Gerhardt in Berlin.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56.** **August 1910.** **No. 8.**

## The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church.

(Continued.)

The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church shows itself above all in its position on Scripture. If one wants to be clear about the position of the Reformed Church, one is confronted from the beginning with the strange fact that there is no Reformed Church at all in the sense that there is a Lutheran or Roman Catholic Church. The Reformed Church has no symbols, nor even a single confessional document, which has universal ecclesiastical validity. When we say that the Reformed Church has no symbols, we mean to say that all the confessional writings found in her are only confessional writings. Essentially, she regards them only as venerable historical monuments, not as the norm of public doctrine. It allows the greatest latitude to the subjective confession of faith and full freedom to each particular church to satisfy its confessional instinct. When the well-known Reformed church historian Hagenbach describes the coming into being of the Formula of Concord, he breaks out into a lament: "And where had one come to in half a century? To the point that the Augsburg Confession, which was only supposed to be the expression of the common faith, as far as it had been investigated at that time, received a binding force for all times; to the point that now even this letter of the Augsburg Confession was no longer sufficient, and that one thus again set up a new letter in the Formula of Concord, and thus believed to cover the one bulwark of the church by the other". (Hagenb. 4, 285.) From this complaint it is clear what position Hagenbach takes on the confessional writings of the church. In another place he requires of the preacher of the Reformed Church only that he administer his ministry in accordance with the "leading principles of the Reformation." Exactly the same position is held by Spurgeon. The latter once read in public worship from three different confessions, among which was a confession of the Baptist Church.

After he finished his lecture, he continued, "As for these human authorities, I care not one rush for all three of them. I care not what they say, pro or con, as to this doctrine. I have only used them as a kind of confirmation to your faith, to show you that whilst I may be railed upon as a heretic and as a hyper-Calvinist, after all I am backed up by antiquity."

This position of the Reformed toward the ecclesiastical confessions is founded in their different school of thought. The Reformed spirit, which alone has produced ten different interpretations of the words, "This is my body," and which only agree in negating the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, while affirming nothing certain, can of course produce no symbols according to which the church is to teach unanimously as according to a **norma normata.** The spirit to which no single article of faith is absolutely certain truth cannot possibly concede to the confessional writings the position which the Lutheran Church gives to her own, when she declares that she "will not deviate a finger's breadth from her symbols either **in rebus** or **in phrasibus,** but will persevere in them, and will also regulate all religious controversy and its declarations according to them. Yet the Reformed Church has not even officially professed the three ecumenical creeds and has thus renounced the connection with the apostolic church. When Calvin and the Geneva theologians were accused of Arianism by a certain Caroli, and he demanded of them, as a cleansing testimony, that they should subscribe to the three ecumenical creeds, they refused to do so. Hagenbach, from whom we take this historical news, adds: "They refused to do so, not because they had broken with their contents, but because they did not want to bow under any yoke of the letter." (Hagenb. 3, 576.) Yes, of the so-called Athanasian Confession Calvin remarks bluntly that the ancient Church, to which it is ascribed, "would never have approved it." Luther, on the other hand, says of the same confession, "It is thus conceived that I do not know whether anything more important and more glorious has been written in the church of the New Testament since the time of the apostles." Even such words as "Trinity," "Person," Calvin did not want to be used. However, this did not prevent the same Calvin, in order to get a position in Strasbourg, from signing the Augsburg Confession.

This absence of any symbol in the Reformed Church in the sense of our church, "as a rule and guide as to how all doctrine is to be judged according to God's Word," sheds significant light on the Reformed position on Scripture. If Scripture is a certain, clear **norma normans,** then a certain, clear confession is required with it as a **norma normata.** If the sayings are

-If the truth of Scripture is clear and certain, then the church must also be able and willing to say a certain and clear yes and amen to it. A church which denies the can or denies the will thus clearly indicates that, in spite of all the fine talk to the contrary, it does not in fact recognize Scripture as the only source and norm in matters of faith. He who, with the apostle, declares the Scriptures to be from his heart a "firm, prophetic word," must also, with the same apostle, make the demand, "If any man speak, that he speak it as the word of God." He who dares not say the latter of his doctrine, necessarily lacks the former. He who will not say of any confession of faith that this is fine confession, according to which he will believe and teach in all things, not "inasmuch as" but "because" it agrees with God's Word, thereby makes the Word of God itself vacillating, and denies to it the quality of distinctness and reliability, and thus its authority as the sole source and standard in matters of faith. And this is precisely what the Reformed Church does already by its position on the ecclesiastical confessions.

We need not, however, be content with indirect evidence to show that the Reformed position on Scripture is a rationalistic one. There is plenty of direct evidence. It is true that even in Reformed confessional writings, as, for example, in the first chapter of the second Helvetic Confession, many sayings are found in which it is confessed that the Scriptures are God's unbreakable Word, from which one may not deviate either to the right or to the left; but such correct confessions are practically completely annulled by the contrary conduct and pronouncements of recognized Reformed theologians.

To the Reformed, Scripture is not free from all error; even a "pious deceit" is not excluded here and there. Calvin writes: "When there (Ps. 22) David complains that he has been robbed of his clothes by his enemies, he understands by the word 'clothes' metaphorically all that he had, as if he had said in a word that he had been robbed and stripped by the ungodly. By not observing this trope, the evangelists depart from the proper sense." Further, the interpretation which the Epistle to the Hebrews chap. 2, 6 of Ps. 8, 5, and Paul Eph. 4, 8 of Ps. 68, 19, he calls an application to the person of Christ obtained by a **pia deflectio.** (Quoted in Baier I, 100.)

To the Reformed, Scripture is not the only source of knowledge in matters of faith. In declaring Scripture to be the only principle of knowledge, our church most emphatically rejects reason as such. For such rejection she has good reason under foot: 1 Cor. 1, 21; 2, 4. 5. 14; Col. 2, 8. Even the born again and enlightened reason can

The reason for this is that, according to 2 Corinthians 10:5, this is the very essence of enlightened reason, that it surrenders itself to the obedience of Christ, and thus does not make itself, but only Scripture, the principle of knowledge. In opposition to this, the Reformed theologian Biesterfeld writes: "Nothing need be traduced among Christians as new, which is taken from the most perfect patterns of Holy Scripture and sound reason, and is derived from these two most ancient lights, which are as the sun and moon." (Masius, p. 16.) Hagenbach speaks at length on this subject. He writes: "The assertion that true enlightenment in religious matters does not depend merely on the correct grammatical and logical understanding of Scripture, but that a spirit in us which is akin to the Divine must appropriate the Divine which comes to us from without and, as it were, transform it into sap and blood, is in and of itself so reasonable a demand, and so perfectly appropriate to the right spirit of religion, that the misrecognition of it, which has unfortunately prevailed at all times, is only to be regretted; for the Bible itself assures us that the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive. . . . So much the less are we to be surprised when individuals - and these were certainly the more spiritual and truly religious people - once more reached into their own bosoms and listened to the voice which also comes to us from there and not merely from the page of the written book, and endeavored to read in the fleshy tables of the heart, of which the apostle speaks, as well as in the brazen tables of the law or even in the paper ones of the confessional writings. . . . And as much as those were mistaken who believed that one could draw from the sacred books an already outwardly finished truth without regard to the inward voice of the heart, so much were those right who maintained that one must also measure and test what is inwardly experienced and given by the written word of God. . . . But instead of drawing the fresh spirit of life from the newly opened source (the Scriptures), the later Protestantism clung to the letter with such timidity and treated the Scriptures like a human law-book, which one opens sometimes at the back, sometimes at the front, in order to find out the will of the Lawgiver, without this will being grasped in its harmony with the innermost need of our spirit. The extreme view of man's corruption and his natural inability to discern good, the assumption that his reason is blind as a bat in regard to the doctrine of salvation, might in part, without wishing it, favor this purely external mode of proceeding." (Hagenb. 4, 366.) Against this, Walther writes: "We recognize only an organic or instru-

The reason of the Bible is a mental use in passages dealing with faith, but a material use only in passages dealing with natural things, never a corrective or one that separates truth from alleged error." (L. u. W. 13, 108.)

The Reformed principle of reason is even more evident when it comes to Scripture as the standard by which all teaching and interpretation is to be judged. No word of Scripture, no matter how clear, is considered reliable and credible as soon as it is incomprehensible to reason, that is, as soon as reason is unable to speculate how it can be true. In all such cases the statements of Scripture are measured, corrected, and reinterpreted by such standards as: **Finitum non est capax infiniti. - Impossibile est, unum corpus simul in pluribus locis esse. - Quare necesse est Christianis, tam difficilia et impossibilia credere**? and the like innumerable more. In what diametrical contrast to such Aristotelian dicta of reason stands the Lutheran principle: **Propter absurdum rationis humanae non est discedendum a regula fidei**. How completely different from the position of Calvin, Beza 1) and other Reformed theologians is Luther's position on Scripture! Luther writes, among other things: "If I could not understand what Luke means, that Christ has increased in spirit and wisdom, I would do honor to the fine word, as God's word, and believe it to be true, even though I could never understand how it could be true; and I would abandon my own dreamed articles of faith as human folly, which is far too small a measure or guide for divine truth.

1) The following incident at the colloquium in Mömpelgard shows what a horrible rationalism Beza was inspired with. After Jakob Andreä had said something about 1 Cor. 11, 26, he continued: "But we put this into the form of a syllogism. Whoever eats the bread in the Lord's Supper eats Christ's body. The ungodly eat the bread in the Lord's Supper. So the ungodly eat Christ's body. And so, not by spurning, but by receiving, they eat Christ's body to themselves for judgment." Beza: "Prove the supersentence!" Andreä: "Paul writes 1 Cor. 10: 'The bread which we -break is the fellowship of the body of Christ.' Not does he say the fellowship of the forgiveness of sins, but the fellowship of the body of Christ." Beza: "Prove by a syllogism!" Andreä: "The statements of Scripture do not need to be proved by a syllogism, but they are believed because of divine authority." Beza: "Make a syllogism!" Andreä: "This is new, and unheard of in all schools, to prove testimonies of Scripture by syllogisms." Beza: "Make a syllogism!" Andreä: "The true meaning of a passage of Scripture is not to be b e proved by a syllogism, but from the Scriptures. And of what kind is a communion where there is no receiving?" Beza: "The body of Christ is communicated in the purpose of God, that is, it is offered to all; but the ungodly do not receive it, because they do not put on Christ." (Journal IV, 115.)

For the sake of brevity, we will pass over much that would otherwise belong here, but we will point out only one point in which the Reformed spirit, in its attitude toward Scripture, proves to be fundamentally different from the Lutheran spirit. The Lutheran Church confesses: "The word of Holy Scripture has in itself life-giving and saving power. The Reformed, on the other hand, say: In the Word is not the power to make blessed, but the Holy Spirit expresses His power with and apart from the Word. Zwingli writes in the Creed of 1530: "To the Spirit there is no need of guide nor chariot, for he himself is the power and the bearer, by whom all things are borne, who has no need to be borne." The Second Helvetic Confession says: "This preaching of the gospel is called by the apostle the Spirit and ministry of the Spirit, because it is made effectual and living by faith in the ears, yea, in the hearts, of them that believe by the enlightening Spirit. For the letter, which is opposed to the Spirit, signifies indeed every outward thing, but especially the doctrine of the law." (Günther's Symb., 68. 192.) The Reformed mind in its position to Scripture is accordingly one which **in thesi** coordinates reason to Scripture, and therefore necessarily in **praxi** subordinates Scripture to reason. It proceeds from the principle that reason and "well-understood Scripture" are in complete harmony with each other. Wherever, therefore, a disharmony between reason and Scripture shows itself - and where should it not show itself, if reason is to judge according to its principles? -this haughty spirit seeks the fault not in reason, but in a false understanding of Scripture. But this false understanding, as this spirit asserts, has its ground in the awkward, strange manner of speaking of the Holy Spirit. Therefore now the "stiff letter" of Scripture is so long tampered with, so much of the Spirit speaking in its own bosom is breathed into these "empty, dead husks," so much is put into the statements of Scripture which are contrary to reason, these are so long corrected and cured, until at last a sense is made right which is in complete harmony with reason. And this "Scripture well understood" is then the Scripture which it is impossible not to exalt, praise, and extol. Why then should not such a Scripture be praised? After all, every hen clucks when she has laid an egg. And what is this "well-understood Scripture" but an egg of human reason, for which the Scripture has had to give up the nest?

According to the spirit peculiar to him, a Reformed man speaks as such to God: Should you have said, "This is my body, this is my blood"? Should bad water carry thy spirit with it? Shall human speech convey thy spirit and gifts? Shall

thou hast wrapped thyself in human language, and sat upon the chariot of the sacraments? Shouldst thou submit to my reason such difficult and impossible things to believe? No, the finite cannot contain thee infinite; thou canst not thus diminish thyself. But in me dwells a "spirit akin to the divine," which can "expand hopefully to the eternal." This spirit in me knows how to interpret your secret signs and allegories. He knows how to pick you out from under the misleading letter. He has a light in which he recognizes thee, the eternal light. He swings up to thee in thy heaven, and there beholds thy majesty hidden from the material eye. He speaks to thee, and thou to him, "as one spirit speaks to another spirit." The letter, thy written word, killeth; it is only the spirit that maketh alive.

A Lutheran as such uses quite different language. He opens the Bible with the sigh in his heart, "Lord, behold the wretched man, and he that is of a broken spirit, and fears thy word!" Though he may be among the cleverest in the world as to worldly knowledge; though he may be instructed, like Moses, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, yet when he draws nigh to the fiery bush of Scripture, he takes off the shoes of his carnal reasoning; then he says, "Speak, Lord! Thy servant will not criticize, nor rhyme, nor measure, but will hear, accept, and believe. Oh, my knowledge and my understanding are covered with darkness! Not with my light will I enlighten thy word, but the light of thy word shall enlighten me. Not in my light, but in thy light will I know the light. I will not lift up my spirit unto thee, but I will thank thee continually that thou hast condescended unto me; that thou art near me in my mouth; that thou hast put thy wisdom, thy truth, and thy grace into human speech. Then will I seek thee by faith, and by faith comprehend, as thou hast revealed thyself. You do not contradict my reason, if only I do not contradict you with my reason; for you are higher than all reason. Thou puttest before me nothing impossible to believe; for with thee no thing is impossible. In thy word there is nothing inconsistent: for all things have passed through thy mouth, as silver seven times refined. In thy word there is nothing contradictory: for with thee there is no change of light and darkness. Thy judgments and thy ways, though they are often strange unto me, are truth and love: for thou art truth and love. Thou art good, and there is no wrong in thee. Thou art right in all thy words; Thou remainest pure when thou art judged.

But while the reformed spirit on the one hand makes itself God in unbridled arrogance, it laments again on the other hand over the inadequacy of its knowledge, and cries out with Pilate

from "What is Truth?" As the heathen at one time worshipped their idols, sacrificed to them, and even defended them with their lives, but at another time mocked and flouted them, so does the Reformed man as such with his idol, his reason. While he exalts reason above God, masters his wisdom, and sets limits to his omnipotence, he at the same time ridicules the same divine reason. His beliefs, after all, are to him only opinions, which may possibly be false. He looks down with a contemptuous smile on the "divine reason" of earlier centuries. He promises himself quite different emanations of his mind in the future. He has not a single saying of whose content he is certain beyond all doubt. He wanders through all the arid places of philosophical systems, seeks peace and does not find it. The only consolation he knows to find is the universal consolation of all doubters and unbelievers: Nothing matters what one believes, if one only lives piously.

What a very different peculiarity of character the Lutheran spirit shows even in this point! A Lutheran as such is certain of his faith; he would let a thousand throats hang over it. All the doubts of his heart, all the pleas of his reason, all the temptations of Satan, he meets and overcomes with "It is written!" Upon this rock he has built the house of his faith, and so, like the rock upon which it rests, it is firm and immovable. In this rock house he sings in good days and in evil: "Let the word stand, and have no thanks; he is with us well on the plan with his spirit and gifts. Take their body, goods, honor, child and wife: let them go there! they have no profit; the kingdom must remain with us.

(To be continued.)

## The Means of Grace according to the Presbyterian Confession.

Mau not infrequently encounters the opinion that the Presbyterians are closest to us Lutherans, and that there is actually not so great a difference between these two church communities. It is not only those who take their confession lightly who express this view; one probably finds this view held among the serious-minded as well. In a place where the founding of a Lutheran congregation was not making much progress, because only a few Lutherans were present and the prospect of growth seemed small, one of the small group, a man who was really serious about his Lutheranism, said in confidence to the missionary Lutheran pastor that he had already thought for some time that, if the Lutheran congregation were to be founded, it would be a good thing to have a Lutheran congregation.

it should come to nothing with the Lutheran mission in that place, then he wanted to join the Presbyterians there; whether he could do that with a clear conscience? He did not want to and could not be without a church, and he thought that among all church communities the Presbyterians were most closely related to the Lutherans. The man was not indifferent to the doctrine; he was not at all unionistic. He sincerely believed that there was no real difference. He lacked the right insight. Such experiences are not isolated, just as it is a fact that Lutherans, when they do not find their church in one place, are most likely to adhere to a Presbyterian congregation, if there is one.

It is true that as far as the constitution and customs are concerned, there is often not such a great difference to be noticed between us and the Presbyterians, if one looks only at the outward appearance. Moreover, the Presbyterians often use expressions and phrases in the exposition of their doctrine which sound very similar to those of the Lutheran Church. If, therefore, one does not examine the matter more closely, it may well happen that one is misled. In reality, however, there is a profound and essential difference between the Presbyterian and Lutheran doctrines, and because of the misunderstanding of the facts that so often comes to light, it is all the more necessary that we be well oriented, so that we can also give the people certain information.

It should not be forgotten that the Westminster Confession seeks to establish a logical system of doctrine that can be discerned by reason. In doing so, it assumes the sovereignty of God. As an unlimited Lord, God has eternally laid down his plan, his fine counsels. According to these, for the glorification of his glory, he has predestined certain men and angels to eternal life, and others to eternal death. From this proposition it is then further concluded in the following manner: As God hath predestinated the elect unto glory, so hath he, according to the eternal and altogether free purpose of his will, predestinated all the means thereof. Therefore the elect, having fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ; they are effectually called to faith in Christ by His Spirit, who works in His time; they are justified, made children, adopted, sanctified, and preserved by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and made blessed by Christ, but only the elect. (***Confession of Faith,* Art. III. VI. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, being its standards, etc. Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work**, 1903.) The American Presbyterians have, indeed, modified the Confession in some points, also there are

among them different tendencies: some are stricter, others freer; but the fundamental view of the Confession they all wish to hold, D. Charles Hodge, representative of the old school, wrote before the union in 1870**:** "**The Westminster Confession contains three distinct classes of doctrines: first, those common to all Christians; second, those common to all Protestants, and by which they are distinguished from Romanists; thirdly, those which are peculiar to the Reformed churches, by which they are distinguished on the one hand from Lutherans and on the other from the Arminians and other sects of later historical origin.**" Then it says: "**All these classes of doctrines we profess to believe, as far as they constitute a 'system of doctrine'-*i. e.*, we profess to be Christians; more definitely, to be Protestants; more definitely yet, to be Calvinists**." And D. Henry B. Smith, representative of the new school: "**The system of the confession, as everybody knows, is the Reformed or Calvinistic system, in distinction from the Lutheran, or Arminian, the Antinomian, the Pelagian, and the Roman Catholic. No one can honestly and fairly subscribe to the confession who does not accept the Reformed or Calvinistic system." (A. A. Hodge: *Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, pp.** 542. 543.)

It is obvious that with this basic view, which inverts or simply ignores many statements of Holy Scripture, which directly contradicts divine revelation at many points, and which completely ignores the fact that we will only recognize bits and pieces here, the whole doctrinal position must become more or less inverted. Thus we shall also find that the doctrine of the means of grace according to the Presbyterian confession is in many respects a false one. In seeking to prove this in what follows, we shall, of course, confine ourselves to the official exposition of the doctrine, as given chiefly in the Confessional Scriptures themselves.

The difference between us and the Presbyterians is already evident in the answer to the question: What are the means of grace? For they include more than Word and Sacrament.... In the ***Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith*,** adopted by the **General Assembly of** this country in 1902, it is true that it states: "**We receive the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper alone divinely established and committed to the Church, together with the Word, as means of grace, made effectual only by the Holy Spirit and always to be used by Christians with prayer and praise to God.**" (Xrt. XIV.) We do not now enter further into the last words of this article, but first only observe that here, however, the Word and the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are mentioned as means of grace. Thus it is also said in the sixth section of the VII article of the Westminster Confession: "**Under the Gospel,**

when Christ, the substance, was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed are the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper." But in the first section of the XIV chapter we read, "The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts, and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word; by which also and by the administration of the sacraments and *prayer*[1] ) it is increased and strengthened." According to this, then, prayer also belongs to the means of grace, at least to the means by which faith is strengthened and promoted. The Catechism goes even further. The answer to question 154 is: "The outward and ordinary means, whereby Christ communicates to His Church the benefits of His mediation, are all His ordinances, *especially* the Word, Sacraments, and prayer; all of which are made effectual to the elect for their salvation." The Word, the Sacraments, and prayer, then, are especially the means of grace; there are, accordingly, others.

*Fisher's Catechism* elaborates: "What are the ordinances by which Christ communicates to us the benefits of redemption? They are prayer and thanksgiving, in the name of Christ; the reading, preaching, and hearing of the Word; the administering and receiving the Sacraments; church government and discipline; the ministry and maintenance thereof; religious fastings; swearing by the name of God, and vowing unto Him. . . . Why is it said, especially the Word, Sacraments, and prayer? Because, though the other ordinances above mentioned are not to be excluded, as being all of them useful in their own place, yet the Word, Sacraments, and prayer, are the chief or principal, outward means for communicating the benefits of redemption. Acts 2:42." And Prof. Hodge, in his Commentary, p. 278, says: "We have seen above, under ch. XIII, that sanctification is a progressive work of the Holy Spirit, and that the inward means are the truth, prayler, the Sacraments, and the gracious discipline of divine providence. Whatever tends to promote sanctification must promote the strength of faith, which is its main root. Therefore faith must be nourished by the truth, prayer, the Sacraments, and every means of grace." According to this, then, much more than Word and Sacrament belongs to the means of grace; the term means of grace, according to Presbyterian doctrine, is a very broad one.

Our confession speaks differently; it knows no other means of grace than the word and the sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper. According to the Apology, verbum et sacramenta are bie instrumenta, per quae Deus movet corda ad credendum. (Müller, p. 160.) In the

1) Blocking throughout by us.

In the Schmalkaldic Articles it is said: "Therefore we should and must insist that God will not deal with us men except by his outward word and sacrament. (p. 322.) The Formula of Concord, in the Epitome, says: "Let us therefore report from God's Word how a man is converted to God, how and by what means (namely, by the oral Word and the holy sacraments) the Holy Spirit is to be strong in us, and to work and give true repentance, faith, and new spiritual strength and ability for good in our hearts, and how we are to conduct ourselves against such means and use them." (p. 600.) And in the **Solida Declaratio**: "But that it is said that no man cometh to Christ, but the Father draweth him, is right and true. But the Father will not do this without means, but has ordained his Word and Sacrament as proper means and instruments' for this purpose, and it is neither the Father's nor the Son's will that a man should not hear or despise the preaching of his Word, and wait for the drawing of the Father without Word and Sacrament. For the Father draws with the power of his Holy Spirit, but according to his common order by the hearing of his holy divine word, as with a net, by which the elect are snatched out of the devil's jaws, to which every poor sinner should dispose himself, hear the same with diligence, and not doubt the drawing of the Father. For the Holy Ghost will be with the word with his power, and work thereby, and this is the drawing of the Father." (p. 720.) We shall have to return to this exposition later, when we deal with the effect of the means of grace. For the present we are only concerned to state that our confession, unlike that of the Presbyterians, knows of no other means of grace than Word and Sacrament.

But how does one come to count even more than Word and Sacrament among the means of grace? Let us take prayer, for example. Surely this is not on the same line as word, baptism, and the Lord's Supper. As proof that prayer is a means of grace, Acts 2:41, 42 are cited. 2, 41. 42: "They therefore that gladly received his word were baptized . . . But they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer." The fact that prayer, as well as communion, are here put together with baptism, the word, and the breaking of bread, does not, after all, put the former on an equal footing with the latter as means of grace. It is not the purpose of this account to instruct us as to the means by which those people obtained grace; we have here merely an indication of what the first Christians did. Further, Luk 22:32 is mentioned, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and if thou be converted some day, strengthen thy brethren." Here it is to be observed, that when Christ prayeth for Petrum.

This is something different from Christians praying for one another. Christ's intercession is the intercession of our Savior. And what the content of his intercession was, he told us, for example, in his high priestly prayer, that the Father would preserve his own in his name, that is, in his word. But if Peter, as again a convert, is to strengthen his brethren, this certainly includes intercession, but is really called, by teaching, exhortation, 2c., bringing them near to the word of God. Compare the epistles of Peter, e.g. 2 Pet. 3:1: "This is the other epistle which I write unto you, in which I remind and awake your sincere minds, that ye remember the words which were spoken unto you before of the holy prophets, and our commandment, which we are apostles of the Lord and Saviour." Nor can intercession itself, if it be of a right kind, have any other content than this: "Sanctify them in thy dignity. Thy word is truth." No, prayer is not a means by which God applies and gives us his grace; it is not a chariot by which God supplies us with his grace. Prayer is on a different line from word and sacrament. These are vehicles of divine grace; that is, through them divine grace is not only proclaimed, offered, proffered, but actually given, appropriated, sealed to men. Thus the gospel is the power of God to save, Rom. 1:16; the incorruptible seed, of which we are born again, 1 Pet. 1:23; baptism is the bath of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost, Tit. 3:5; and the holy supper is the memorial supper of Christ our Saviour, in which we partake of the body given for us, and the blood shed for us for the remission of our sins. The power of prayer, on the other hand, is not its own, is not one that lies in prayer as such; prayer is rather the fruit and effect of the means of grace, the Word and the sacraments, and what it obtains, it obtains precisely by virtue of the promises of grace given by God in his Word. It cannot, therefore, be coordinated with the Word and the sacraments, any more than it can be coordinated with God's guides of grace. These are external means that come directly from God, but according to God's order they do not impart grace in and of themselves, but lead to the ordered means of grace, as it is written: "In the midst of temptation, take heed to the word", Isaiah 28:19.

Before we go any further, let us make one more remark. When our Confession calls Word and Sacrament the ordinary means and instruments of grace, it is not the same as the Presbyterian **ordinary, ordinarily**. We use the word in the sense of orderly. After all, God can use other means. Why not? Everything is in his power, after all. But that's the ord-

The choice he has made is to give us his grace through Word and Sacrament. Other means are not revealed to us. But with the Presbyterians the word has the meaning ordinary. Word and sacrament are to them the ordinary, principal, most distinguished means of grace, besides which they know a number of others.

We now repeat our question: How does one come to count even more than Word and Sacrament among the means of grace? Apparently there is a different conception of the term means of grace. This can be seen, among other things, from the explanations that ***Fisher's Catechism*** gives to question 88 of the Large Catechism. There it is first explained why it is said that word, sacrament, and prayer are especially the means by which Christ communicates to us the blessings of his redemption. All the other means mentioned are not to be excluded, since each is useful in its own way, but word, sacrament, and prayer are the chief and most distinguished means of communicating the benefits of salvation. Then the particular **usefulness**, **the special usefulness, of** these most distinguished means of grace is stated. For brevity we omit the questions, and give merely the answers. "**In the Word these benefits are *exhibited and offered to* sinners of mankind, as the ground of their faith, that believing they may be possessed of them all, John 20, 31. The Sacraments *represent to* our senses, 1 Cor. 10, 16, *what the Word does to our faith,* and are designed for the confirmation of *it,* Rom. 4, 11. The prayer of faith fetches home to the soul all the good that is wrapped up both in the Word and in the Sacraments, Mark 11, 24: 'What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them**.'" Note the words we have emphasized. So the Word sets forth and offers the blessings of Christ's redemption. The sacraments present to our senses the same thing that the Word presents to faith, and confirm that, namely, the truths which the Word presents. And prayer brings to the soul all the goods which are concluded in Word and Sacrament. According to this, the means of grace are not understood as δοτικά, that is, as such as actually give, appropriate, and seal grace, and bring a man to faith, and sanctify and maintain him in faith, but means of grace is no more than acquaintance with salvation, offering of salvation, affirmation of the fact of salvation. Word and sacrament show man that God is gracious, but do not give the grace of conversion and preservation in the state of grace. Prayer, then, as the means of acquiring this grace, would be even more of a means of grace than word and sacrament, not, of course, from God's side, but from that of man. And in view of the decisiveness with which otherwise the total ruin of the

The fact that the natural human being can acquire the blessings of salvation through prayer remains incomprehensible. But we can understand, after this explanation, that many other things are also counted among the means of grace.

Lest we be misunderstood! We do not quarrel about expressions and definitions, if only we have the matter right in every case. The word "means of grace" does not occur in Scripture. If anyone wishes to define the term more broadly, so that it includes everything that in one way or another contributes to the grace of God being brought to man, this cannot be denied him. Our dogmatists also speak of means of grace **late sic dicta**. We have an analogous case in the question of the number of sacraments. The Apology says that some things may be counted among the sacraments, such as marriage, prayer, alms, the cross, etc., according to the definition one makes of the word. Then, however, it is said, "But no man of understanding will make a great dispute whether seven or more sacraments be counted, yet so far that God's word and command be not broken off." (Müller, p. 204.) This is what matters, that God's word and command be not broken off. Whoever accepts baptism and the Lord's Supper fully and completely in their scriptural meaning, may then, after all, in a broader sense, count many other things among the sacraments. But if one counts more sacraments in the sense that he puts baptism and the Lord's Supper on the same level with the others, he is obviously teaching wrongly, for then he is taking away from God's Word as far as baptism and the Lord's Supper are concerned. So it is now in the present case. One may take the means of grace in a broader sense, if only God's word and command are not broken off, that is, if one then leaves only word and sacrament in their full scriptural meaning. But the thing becomes wrong if this meaning is thereby weakened and depressed. And that is the point here. According to Scripture, Word and Sacrament are the means by which God's grace is not merely proclaimed and offered, but appropriated and sealed to man; they are the means by which man is brought to faith, preserved in faith, and sanctified. According to Presbyterian doctrine, word and sacrament do not have this power; it must be extra added by the Holy Spirit.

It is, then, above all, a denial of the power and effect of the Word and of the sacraments, with which we have to do here. How does one think of the matter? In the 51st volume of this magazine (p. 301 ff.) it is explained, among other things, how the Presbyterians separate the Word and the Spirit, namely, that the Word is usually a mere word without power; it only then becomes

effective when the Holy Spirit is especially present. We should also note Fisher's explanation of this question in the Large Catechism: "**Why called *outward* means? To distinguish them from faith, repentance, and other inward means; and especially to distinguish them from the inward and powerful influences of the Holy Spirit, which are necessary to accompany the outward means in order to salvation, Zech. 10, 6. - Are the ordinances of themselves effectual for communicating the benefits of redemption? No, they are *made effectual*, Rom. 1, 16. - To whom are they made effectual? To the *elect* only, Acts 13, 48. - What may we learn from the Spirit's making the means effectual to salvation? That as no special blessing can be expected from God, in the willful neglect of the ordinances, Prov. 28, 9; so we may sit all our days under a pure dispensation of the Gospel without reaping any spiritual profit, unless divine supernatural agency concur, 1 Cor. 3, 6." (p**. 174.) Certainly, it is the Holy Spirit .who gives power to the word, and the operation of the Spirit comes to its full fruit only in the elect. So also our Confession testifies in the above passage, "The Father begets with the power of fine Holy Spirit, yet, according to His common order, by the hearing of His holy divine Word, as with a net, whereby the elect are plucked out of the devil's jaws." But the Spirit must not be separated from the Word, as if the Word fei with some a mere word without power, but with others a Word operative by the Holy Spirit. God's word is not different in different men. According to the Scriptures, Christ's words are spirit and life, the living seed. This is spoken generally. It is not such a word only for those who are truly converted and saved, because for them the Holy Spirit has joined himself to the word, but the word is the same in all cases. That it does not have its effect on all is not because of the Word, not because it is Word without Spirit, but because men resist the Spirit of God, who wants to work through the Word, because they do not want to let the Spirit of God punish them. Now, in the interest of their false doctrine of election, the Presbyterians, out of reason, make the distinction between Word without Spirit and Work with Spirit, and so between effectual and non-effectual calling. "**Effectual calling being the actual saving of a soul from death of sin by the mighty power of God, it is obvious that it must be applied to all who are saved, and that it cannot be applied to any who are not saved**." (Hodge, op. cit., p. 224.) Scripture is admittedly relied upon for this divorce; but how? When it is said that those who were ordained to eternal life believed, it is readily concluded that for the rest the Word was without the Spirit. So also from the saying of Paul: "I have

planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the flourishing." But such inferences are not proofs, for they are not necessary inferences. It is easy to suppose that it is the fault of the Word, or of God, if the effect is not forthcoming, but we forget what else Scripture says of the Word, and overlook the fault of man. Note, then, that when the Presbyterians praise Word and Sacrament as means of grace, they connect with them other terms than we do. And this is not merely a difference of definition, but a false doctrine of the nature and power of these means. If the slogan, "The Spirit, the Spirit!" does not ring out quite so loudly here, it is clear enough that the Presbyterians stand on the Reformed standpoint and not on the Lutheran standpoint.

This underestimation of the means of grace affects the other doctrinal position at more than one point. Many things that are otherwise right become crooked as a result. Thus, for example, in the first article of the Confession, the inspiration, the divinity of the Holy Scriptures, is clearly and distinctly testified to. It is also rightly said that through the testimony of the church, through the agreement of all the individual parts of Scripture, etc., one can come to a kind of conviction that the Bible must be truth fine; but the divine certainty must be wrought through the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. A rich collection of proofs is adduced in support of this. If one considers all this in isolation, one can only rejoice. But if we consider these remarks in the light of what we have heard above about this witness of the Holy Spirit, we are disappointed. The Spirit, after all, is not in and of itself in the Word, but must first be specially added. The reader or hearer of Scripture must wait to see if the Holy Spirit will join Himself to the Word. We are referred to 1 John 1:20, 27; John 6:45; 1 Corinthians 2:9, 10, 12. But from the fact that Christians have the anointing, the Spirit, and are taught by God, we must not conclude that the Spirit is not there for the others. It is only stated that the effect is present in the Christians. Joh. 16, 13. 14 cannot be used in general for the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit, because the Lord speaks especially of the inspiration, which the apostles should receive as preachers of His gospel.

Of the fall of man, of original sin, of redemption through Christ, of man's utter inability to do anything in spiritual matters, of conversion as the work of God alone, is moreover rightly taught. But Christ is said to have truly redeemed only the elect, and so God has also promised to give his Holy Spirit to those who are ordained to eternal life, so that they may become willing and able to receive salvation.

believe. It has pleased God to call all those whom he has predestined to life, and only these, by word and spirit. Here we see what is the practical interest of separating the Spirit from the Word. Thus it is explained why, in the case of the very same original sin, some are converted before others. But as certain as it is that only in the elect does the Spirit accomplish his purpose through the Word, so that the expressions "elect" and "called" are often used identically, not indeed in the term, but certainly in the scope, it is nevertheless wrong, according to the whole Scripture, to represent the matter as if the Word were different in different persons.

The justification of a sinner before God is properly represented as a judicial act of God, not as an infusion of righteousness, but as **imputatio**. But when it is said that the elect are not actually justified until the Holy Spirit appropriates Christ to them in his time, this is again to be understood of a special effect. For the word is different for those who are justified from that for those who are not, not only as to the effect, but in itself. With the latter it is from the first only a powerless word without spirit. In this restrictive sense is to be understood all that is said of the effect of the Holy Spirit in conversion, sanctification, and preservation in the faith.

And where, finally, is the consolation in this doctrinal position? True, it is said of the certainty of the state of grace: "Although hypocrites, and other unregenerate men, may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favor of God and estate of salvation, which hope of theirs shall perish: yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love Him in sincerity, endeavoring to walk in all good conscience before Him, may in this life be certainly assured that they are in a state of grace, and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, which hope shall never make them ashamed. This certainty is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope, but an infallible assurance of faith, founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces whereby these promises are made, the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God, which spirit is the earnest of our inheritance whereby \ve are sealed to the day of redemption." *(Confession of Faith,* ch. XVIII) But if only the elect are redeemed, and God has promised his Spirit only to the elect, if one can live all his life under the sound of the pure Word without profit, unless the Holy Spirit unites himself with the Word, how can one base his hope on the Word? It all comes down to this

that one has the special gift of the Holy Spirit. From there one can draw back and appropriate the divine promises. According to Presbyterian doctrine, therefore, it would not do to draw one's certainty, e. g., from the saying, "Thus God loved the world," etc., by reproaching oneself: therefore God also loved me, and gave his only begotten Son also for my redemption; this firm conviction of mine is the faith that makes me blessed; and this faith is the working of the Holy Spirit in me through the Word. According to Presbyterian doctrine, one should rather first ask: Is the Holy Spirit also with this word, so that the comfort which I take from it is really the comfort of faith, and not merely one of the general effects of the Spirit, which also the unregenerate have, but which do not make them children of God? For one does not look for the Spirit in the Word, but apart from and beside the Word. That the certainty of the state of grace is thought of as a special act of God, appears also from the further exposition: "**This infallible as surance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he partakes of it: yet being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto.**" How very differently our Confession speaks! Compare, for example, -en article of free will in the Formula of Concord. Even with similar-sounding expressions, yet the presentation, the matter is quite different. "Although both the preacher's planting and watering, and the hearer's running and willing, would be in vain, and no conversion would follow, unless the Holy Spirit's power and effect were added, who, through the preached and heard word, enlightens and converts hearts, so that men believe such word and give their assent to it, Let neither preacher nor hearer doubt this grace and effect of the Holy Spirit, but be sure, when the word of God is preached purely and loudly according to the command and will of God, and men listen diligently and earnestly and consider the same, that God is certainly present with his grace and gives as reported, which otherwise man can neither take nor give from his own powers. For of the presence, effect, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, we ought not and cannot always judge **ex sensu**, as and when we feel it in our hearts, but because it is often covered and approached with great weakness, we ought to be sure, from and according to the promise, that the word of God preached and heard is an office and work of the Holy Spirit, through which he is certainly powerful and active in our hearts, 2 Cor. 2." (Müller, p. 601.)

It is evident, then, that the Presbyterians have a different spirit from ours, even as regards the doctrine of the means of grace. Though they are not gross enthusiasts who reject the means of grace altogether, and say that the Holy Spirit needs no chariot to come to us, yet according to them God is not always in the chariot that is used. By separating the Spirit from the Word in the interest of their false doctrine of election, they, as much as there is in them, deprive the Word of its meaning, and with it the poor anxious consciences of their support. But the word of God is the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, Eph. 6:17. "If thy law had not been my consolation, I should have perished in my misery," Ps. 119:92.

We now have to go into the Presbyterian doctrine of the sacraments a little more closely. There are many excellent things said about the sacraments, both in the Confessions and elsewhere; there are beautiful remarks, e.g., about the secondary purposes, and good testimonies against, among other things, the Roman doctrine of the opus operatum and of the mass, as well as against the false exploitation of the word βαπτίζειν on the part of the Baptists. But what grieves us is the perverse position taken on the nature and utility of the sacraments. On this it is first said in general: "Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to *represent* Christ and His benefits, and to confirm our interest in Him. . . . There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; *whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."* (Art. XXII.) A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ in His Church to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace the benefits of His mediation, to strengthen and increase their faith and all other graces. . . . The parts of a sacrament are two: the one an outward and visible sign used according to Christ's own appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby *signified*." (Gr. Cat.) The following remarks indicate still more clearly what *is* meant: "The sign in every sacrament is sacramentally united to the grace which it signifies; and out of this union *the scriptural usage* has arisen of *ascribing to the sign whatever is true of that which the signifies. . '* . . Every sacrament consists of two elements, - a) an outward sensible sign, and b) an inward spiritual grace thereby signified. In Baptism the outward sensible sign is a) water, and b) the water applied in the name of the Triune God to the person of the subject baptized. The inward spiritual grace thereby *signified* is, a) primarily, spiritual purification by the immediate personal power of the Holy Ghost in the soul, and b) hence, secondarily, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, hence the union of the baptized with Christ, hence regeneration, justification,

sanctification, perseverance to the end, etc. - *i. e.,* all the benefits of the new covenant In the Lord's Supper, the outward sensible signs, are a) bread and wine, and b) the consecration and the bread broken, and the wine poured out, distributed to, and received and eaten and drunk by, the communicants. The inward spiritual grace thereby *signified* is, a) primarily, Christ crucified (His flesh torn and blood shed) for us, and giving Himself to us to be *spiritually* received and assimilated as the principle of a new life, and b) hence, secondarily, union with Christ. . . This sacramental union between the sign and the grace which it signified, the Romish and Lutheran -churches understand to be, at least in the case of the Lord's Supper, a literal identity. Thus, when Christ took the bread and said, 'This is my body,' they insist that it means that the bread *is* His body. All other Christians understand the phrase to mean, 'This bread represents sacramentally my body.' This sacramental union, therefore, between the sign and the thing signified is a) symbolical and representative - the one symbolizes and so represents the other; and b) instrumental, because by divine appointment, through the right use of the sign, the grace signified is really conveyed. . . The Sacraments were designed to *represent the* benefits of Christ and the new covenant. They are as signs or pictures of the truths they represent." (Hodge.) "'This is my body broken for you," said the Savior; that is, this broken bread is a symbol of my sacrificed body. 'This is my blood shed for you,' as He took the cup; that is, the wine is a symbol of my blood, a sacrifice for sins." (Geo S. Mott: *Eating and Drinking Unworthily.).* In short, then, as to the nature of the sacraments, the earthly elements are images of heavenly things; as to the benefits, they are images of divine grace. In this sense they are signs and seals of divine grace.

We have repeatedly pointed out that the Presbyterians often use the same expressions as we do, but that they associate with them a very different idea. We make this perception here also. In our Confessions, too, especially in the Apology, it is often said that the sacraments are signs and seals of divine grace. But to the Presbyterians the word "sign" is as much as "image." There are no divine, heavenly things in the sacraments themselves; they are there only in image. There are no heavenly things in the sacraments themselves; they are merely pictured there, and it is only by the right use of the sign that the divine grace pictured in it is given, and so the sacraments are seals to believers. According to our confession, "sign" here is so much as "mark," "visible, external thing or means," to which, according to God's order, the promise is "affixed" (p. 264), "in it the name of God adheres" (p. 489),

"powerful signs and certain testimonies of divine grace and will toward us, by which God reminds and strengthens our hearts to believe the more surely and cheerfully" (p. 259). As to the nature of the sacraments, by the visible means not merely something is pictured, but the heavenly is connected with it; both are contained in the sacrament, quite apart from the right or wrong use of it. And with respect to the benefits, according to our confession, it is thus: the goods of grace are not merely pictured, but are really in them by virtue of the divine promise, without regard to faith or unbelief. Faith is necessary in order to receive, have, and enjoy the goods of grace contained in the sacraments.

But how do Presbyterians prove their position? Rom. 4:11 is repeatedly adduced, "But the sign of circumcision he (Abraham) received for a seal of the righteousness of faith." It is not necessary for our present purpose to examine whether the sacraments of the Old Covenant were entirely the same in nature and purpose as those of the New Covenant, so that exactly the same thing is true of the latter as is said of the former. It is sufficient to refute the Presbyterian! use of the present passage, to point out that sign - σημειον, ***XXX*** - here evidently does not mean image or likeness. For what should circumcision image? How was circumcision to be an image or likeness of the covenant between God and Abraham? Sign here indisputably means "mark." By their circumcision the Israelites were supposed to recognize, to see that they were in covenant with God, the covenant people of God.

In the words of institution, as we are accustomed to do elsewhere among the Reformed, a trope, a figurative mode of speaking, is adopted, and it is instructive to note here again the different uses of an expression well known to us. By sacramental union we understand a real union between the visible elements and the heavenly things in the sacrament, but precisely a sacramental one, that is, such as occurs only in the sacrament, and has no other analogue. To the Presbyterians the sacramental union is only a. spiritual relation between the terms, as between a sign and the thing signified thereby. This is the explanation of the biblical use of language, that the image says what actually belongs only to the thing depicted. Accordingly, sacramental union would be only another expression for metonymy. The matter is thought to be quite easy and simple: "**The sign in every sacrament is sacramentally united to the grace which it signifies, and out of this union the scriptural usage has arisen of ascribing to the sign whatever is true of that which the signifies. . . Out of this spiritual relation, or sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified, which we have thus explained by a natural and legitimate**

**tise of language, the one is put for the other, and whatever is true of the grace signified is asserted of the sign which signifies it." (Hodge.**.) The matter has thus been made very simple, but at the expense of truth. In the exposition of the doctrine of the sacraments it becomes quite evident how much the Presbyterians let themselves be guided by their reason in matters of faith, in spite of all the determination with which they maintain that God's Word must be the rule and guide. This will become clear to us if we take before us the expositions which Hodge gives of the confessions concerning baptism and the Lord's Supper. We see there at the same time what arguments are used against our position.

Against the doctrine of regeneration by baptism is argued thus: "**Whatever is true of baptism with the Holy Ghost is attributed to baptism with water.**" Ananias says to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Christ gave Himself for the church "that He might sanctify her, and cleanse her with the bath of water in the word," Eph. 5, 26. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of JEsu Christ for the remission of sins," Acts. 2, 38. "**Hence Romanists and Ritualists have inferred that the sign is inseparable from the grace signified, and that these spiritual effects are due to the outward ordinance**." If by this also we Lutherans' are to be meant, the representation is false. This is not the way we arrive at our doctrinal position. "**But it must be observed that the Scriptures do not assert those spiritual attributes of water baptism in itself considered, but of water baptism as the sign or emblem of baptism by the Holy Ghost**." The Scriptures do not say that baptism has its effect as the image of baptism by the Holy Ghost, but because it is the bath of water in the Word, because it is the water set forth in God's commandment, and joined to God's Word. One only has to look closely at the sayings cited. "**These spiritual attributes belong only to baptism by the Spirit, and they accompany the sign only when the sign is accompanied with that which it signifies.**" Certainly it is only the Holy Spirit who gives birth again. But as he is inseparably connected with the word heard or read, and thereby works, so, according to God's promise, it is also with the visible word in the sacrament: this is the simple meaning of the Scripture statements in question. But a distinction must be made between the purpose and use which God has put into the sacraments, and the right use or enjoyment of what God has put into the sacraments. Very definitely then it is asserted that the Scriptures do not teach regeneration by baptism. "**The language relied upon to prove it (John 3, 5; Acts 2, 38) is easily explained on the principle that, in virtue of the sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified, what is true of the one is metaphorically predicated of the other**." The

is easily said, but where is the proof? "**There is nothing said of the efficacy of Baptism which is not likewise said of the efficacy of the truth. James 1:18; John 17:19; 1 Pet. 1:23. But the mere hearing of the truth saves no one**." Here again we have the confusion of the means of grace with the right use. At the same time here is a proof of how far men with a preconceived opinion may err. How unambiguously the word is designated in the scriptural passages mentioned as the means by which grace is given. If now, as is right, the efficacy of baptism and the efficacy of the audible Word are placed on the same level, the scriptural statements cited are a crushing blow against the position of the Presbyterians. But they have separated the Word from the Spirit, and do not distinguish between the means of grace and its use; hence such proofs as these. "**Baptism cannot be the only ordinary means of regeneration, because faith and repentance are the fruits of regeneration, but the prerequisites of baptism. Acts** 2:38; 8:37; 10:47." Here we have a tangle of conceptual confusion. If anyone teaches that baptism is the only or proper means of regeneration, we certainly do not teach that. Word and Sacrament are the means of grace, therefore also the means of regeneration. Thus, in the three passages cited, the apostles had before them adult unconverted persons, whom they could approach by the means of grace of the word, who were therefore born again by the word, and then received baptism as the seal of their state of grace. Further, are faith and repentance - **repentance** is here called renewal - to be the fruit of regeneration? There are other concepts of rebirth, faith, renewal than those given to us in Scripture. Renewal or sanctification in the wider sense may well be called a fruit of regeneration, inasmuch as it is a progressive work, but is set at the same time with regeneration. But faith is not a fruit of regeneration, but is regeneration. By faith a man is born again. When a man is said to be born again, it means that he has believed, John 3:5, 16, 18. Thus the argument collapses into itself. As already said, in the case of adults, Scripture makes baptism follow on. But in general it is said that baptism is the bath of water in the Word, the bath of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit, so that it cannot be said that faith and renewal are preconditions of baptism, but that baptism, like the audible Word, is a means of grace for the sake of the Word that is with it, and for the sake of the divine promise, by which faith, confidence, and trust in God are wrought, and thus man is born again as God's child. "**Universal experience in Romanist and Ritualistic communities prove that the baptized are not generally re-**

generated. Our Savior says, 'By their *fruits ye* shall know them,' Matt. 7:20." A bold assertion! Just a few remarks on this. Who is able to look into the hearts of little children? And if the children who were baptized in their childhood and are now grown up show little fruit of the dew, it is either because of other false teachings that suppress the Spirit and grace, or because the children are not duly reminded of the nature, power and meaning of their former baptism, or because the other means of grace, the Word, is not properly used.

The false Reformed spirit may be more evident when we consider the position taken towards us in Holy Communion. Hodge, in his interpretation of the Confession, says: "The Lutherans hold that, while the bread and wine remain, nevertheless at the words of consecration the real body and blood of Christ, though invisibly, are really present in, *with, and under the* bread and wine. The only ground of this doctrine is the word of our Lord, 'This is my body.' They hold the word 'is' is literal; all the Reformed churches hold it must mean 'represents,' 'symbolizes.' This is a frequent use of the word in Scripture. The seven kine *are* the seven years, and the seven good ears *are the seven* years. Gen. 41, 26. 27; Ezek. 37, 11; Dan. 7, 24; Luke 12, 1; Rev. 1, 20. Besides, when our Lord said this and gave them the bread to eat, He was sitting by them in His sound, undivided flesh, eating and drinking with them. This doctrine, then, is false - a) because it is not taught in Scripture; b) because it confounds the very idea of sacrament, making *the sign identical with the thing it signifies,* c) It contradicts our senses, since we see, smell, taste, and feel bread and wine, and do never either see or smell or taste or feel flesh and blood, d) It contradicts reason, for reason teaches that qualities cannot exist except as they are inhere in some substance, and that substance cannot be known and cannot act except by its qualities. But this doctrine supposes that the qualities of bread and wine remain without any substance, and that the substance of flesh and blood remains without any qualities, e) It is absurd and impossible, because Christ's glorified body is still material, and therefore finite, and therefore not omnipresent in all places on earth, but absent at the right hand of God in heaven."

We remark, first of all, that our doctrine is not correctly presented. First of all, it is very misleading to say that we hold that the true Body and Blood of Christ are present in, with, and under the bread and wine in the words of consecration. There the thought is easily suggested of something at least very akin to the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. We say, in the sacramental action, that is, in the use, that includes everything: Distribution, eating, drinking, is Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the bread, and

Wine present. But that our position is really thought of as very similar to the Roman one is otherwise clear from the quotation. They have not understood what we mean by the formula "in, with, and under. It is evidently thought that somehow, though not exactly in the Roman sense, the manner of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is to be determined by it. This is the only explanation when we are accused of making the sign identical with the thing signified, or when it is said that according to our doctrine the properties of the bread and wine remain without any substance, and the substance of the body and blood is without any properties. But we do not teach a transformation of any kind, nor an identity, nor a fusion, as two factors become one by the abolition of the substance of the one and the properties of the other; we teach a sacramental union, a communion of the bread with the body of Christ and of the wine with the blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. We refrain from describing the nature of this union, because the Scriptures do not say anything more about it. And this is what the words "in, with, and under" are meant to express, that according to Scripture we believe a real presence of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine in Holy Communion, but without wanting to specify the nature of this presence. - It may be mentioned here in passing that Hodge also asserts that we teach with the Romans that unleavened bread must be used in the Lord's Supper. Nor is it true that the only ground of our doctrine is the word, "This is my body." Certainly the words of institution are to us the proper **sedes doctrinae** for the doctrine of Holy Communion; but all other sayings concerning this sacrament are also given to us for doctrine, and are also to be used for that purpose, so especially, as regards the present question, 1 Cor. 10:16.

But let us examine a little the reasons which are supposed to refute our doctrine and prove the Presbyterian one. The little word "is" cannot be taken literally, but **must** mean "represents," "signifies. Why? That, he says, is a common use of language in the Scriptures. What kind of reasoning is that! So because it frequently (!) occurs in Scripture that "is" equals "means," it must also be so in the words of institution of Holy Communion. In this convenient way one can, after all, prove anything one wants. Granted that "is," "are," occur in Scripture, even frequently, in the sense of "signifies," yet this is the main thing, that the proof may be furnished that it is so in the present case, and must be so, and cannot be otherwise. But are the examples given also only analogous? We will admit, **disputandi causa,** that there the copula is used in the sense of "to represent," "to depict.

is needed. We can also multiply the list and point out, among other things, the many parables of Christ. But we ask: What do all these passages have to do with Holy Communion? There are dreams, visions, apparitions, parables, in the interpretation of which it is said that the seven cows are, that is, represent, etc., the Holy Communion. But is the Holy Communion a dream, or a vision, or an apparition, or a parable? This would have to be proved before one could go further into this argument. Otherwise, one would cite actual metaphors such as these: Herod is a fox, JEsus is the Lamb of God. But it has been well recognized that the trope lies not in the copula, but in the interconnected terms, and that therefore nothing can be done by such examples to invalidate the words of institution in Holy Communion. But the other way is no better, for what is given does not fit. The words of Christ in the holy supper are unique, they have no analogue; therefore, nothing can be done by other examples to interpret or explain them.

But what shall we say to this, when it is urged that Christ, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, sat among the disciples in His completely undivided flesh, and that therefore He could not have given them His body and blood to eat and drink? To this we say, first, that the words of Christ, "This is my body, this is my blood," are plain and clear; in none of the four accounts is any intimation given to take them otherwise than they just read. Nor do the other passages which deal with the Lord's Supper give any indication of a different interpretation, but confirm what the words of institution say according to simple reason. Now, even if we cannot understand everything, especially if we cannot explain how it was possible for Christ to give his body and blood while he sat with the disciples, our inability to explain it is no reason to depart from what he says. How he carries out his words is his business. We have to keep to his word; reason is to be used to discern the meaning of the words, but not to judge about them. Then again, this objection is based on the false doctrine of the person of Christ, the very same false doctrine that underlies the objection that Christ cannot be present in the Lord's Supper because he has gone to heaven. We must hold that the human nature in Christ is inseparably united with the divine. In Him the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily, Col. 2, 9. From this union follows the communication of the attributes, especially the communication of the divine majesty to human nature. Christ the man is also omnipresent, as he is omnipotent and omniscient. In the state of humiliation, though he did not always use this communicated majesty, yet he did use it. Thus he, the incarnate Son of God, speaks in the

In the state of his humiliation: >Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matth. 18, 20. Therefore, if He was visibly seated among the disciples at the institution of the Lord's Supper according to the manner of being that He had assumed in His state of humiliation, why should He not also be in the bread and wine that was offered according to the omnipresence that was communicated? "Inconceivable!" it will be said. Yes, but this does not detract from the fact that we are dealing with heavenly things, which are beyond our comprehension.

Now what else is said in the quotation given, we may answer in brief. Our doctrine is said to be false because it is not taught in Scripture. Of course, if the Scriptural statements in question have first been cleared out of the way! It is said to be false because it confuses the very concept of sacrament by identifying the sign or image with the thing represented. This is a **petitio principii**. This is what we are supposed to prove first, that in the Holy Communion it is a question of an image and a thing represented. Our doctrine is said to be false because it contradicts the senses, since we never see, smell, taste, or feel flesh and blood, but bread and wine. This is a conclusion of reason which is not permissible in matters of the divine Word. Take captive all reason under the obedience of Christ! The same is true of the next argument, that our position is false because it is contrary to reason, which requires that attributes cannot exist by themselves without a substance to which they are attached, and that a substance can only be known and act through attributes. Here, as I have already said, something is imputed to us which we do not teach at all, namely, that bread and wine are without any substance, and flesh and blood without any properties. And now the climax: our doctrine is said to be false because it is absurd and impossible, since Christ's glorified body is still material and therefore limited and therefore not omnipresent in all places on earth, but absent at the right hand of God in heaven. Here the false doctrine of the person of Christ comes clearly to light, which is also found elsewhere in the Confession, but which we have already refuted above. And clearly enough the false spirit is shown here, which is not ruled by the word, but by the corrupt reason and which finally presents us with a Christ who is no longer a Christ.

In sum, anyone who thinks that the Presbyterians are very close to us Lutherans is caught in a great error. Would to God we were of one mind! But they have a very different spirit from ours; we see this not only in different doctrines, but also in their position on the means of grace, both in general and in particular.

m ....

# Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. Synodical Report of the Southern Illinois District, with a full paper on the "Life of the Archfather Joseph." (17 Cts.)

2. Synodical report of the Western District, with proceedings on the "Trinity of God in the Old Testament." (12 Cts.)

3. Synodal report of the Brazilian District with synodal address, presidential report, report of Praeses Mahler on his trip to North America, short summary of the paper on "Saul and David", mission report, report on Concordia College in Porto Alegre etc. (8 Cts.)

4. Synodical Report of the Northern Illinois District with Proceedings on "The Damages of the Corinthian Church and Paul's Instruction to Dismiss and Overcome Them, a Lesson for Our Churches Also." (17 Cts.)

5. Catalog of teaching schools in the Missouri Synod for the 1909/1910 school year.

6. "Luther's Morals." By Rev J. H. Hartenberger. Reprinted from *Theological Quarterly,* July, 1910. (10 Cts.)

**D. Martin Luther's Complete Writings**, edited by D. J. G. Walch. Twenty-third volume. Main register. New revised stereoth edition. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo. VII pages and 2203 columns. Price: sheepskin edition $5.00; **Law Buckram edition** $4.25.

The publication of the now complete St. Louis edition of Luther's works was first suggested by Fr. Bünger in 1879 and immediately decided upon by the Pastoral Conference of the Western District and later by the entire Synod. The editorship was undertaken by D. Stöckhardt with the assistance of E. W. Kühler. Already in 1880 the first and in 1881 the second volume of Genesis appeared. The preparatory work for the three following volumes of Luther's Postillen was done by Chr. Körner. Candidate H, Bayer edited the tenth volume, the catechetical writings of Luther. In 1884 the Directory employed Prof. A. F. Hoppe, who has now, after twenty-five years' labor, completed the great work. Taken all in all, the historical introductions, the exact fixation of the original text, the new translations of Latin writings, the registers, punctuation, etc., fully apply what D. Stöckhardt says in the "Lutheran": "One calls this new edition of Luther's works cheaply the St. Louis edition. Nothing has essentially remained from the old Walch edition except the arrangement and order of Luther's writings." In Germany and America, then, this St. Louis edition of Luther's works has received well-deserved recognition. And whoever wants to do the Lutheran Church a great service, let him help that this work comes into the sacristies of Lutheran churches, into the libraries of pastors and, if not completely, then at least in several volumes into the homes of Lutheran Christians. The above-mentioned volume of indexes has also been justly praised as an excellent work, which does not merely offer, like a dictionary, incoherent words, but, like a real encyclopedia, coherent thoughts, as it were theses and leading sentences to Luther's detailed discussions on the most diverse subjects. The "Lutheran" writes of the careful, reliable work that has gone into this volume of indexes: "After Prof. Hoppe had completed the index of facts and sayings, he once again looked up and corrected every single passage, so that all futile looking up and searching is as good as eliminated. On this piece of his work alone he has spent nearly 2000 hours." The "Synodal Friend" writes; "We congratulate the Missouri Synod and the Concordia Publishing House on the enterprise, courage, and perseverance they have shown in this. They have thereby earned the abiding thanks of our Lutheran Church. We thank our God that He has caused it to succeed and to be carried to completion." Many other English as well as German, ecclesiastical as well as political journals, judge similarly. F. B.

**Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians.** By D. G. Stoeckhardt. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. price: tzl.25.

No sooner have we enjoyed and appreciated D. Stöckhardt's extremely thorough and reliable commentary on the Epistle to the Romans than the author presents us with a second noble gift: the explanation of the thought-provoking Epistle to the Ephesians. Many books, especially commentaries, are now being put into the world, which must be called unripe fruit. In D. Stöckhardt's commentary, however, we have before us a strong, tasty and fully ripened fruit, thoroughly clarified good old wine, which will taste good to every theologian and true Lutheran who still holds to Scripture and Lutheran symbol. From beginning to end, Stöckhardt's commentary is a logically exact and grammatically careful as well as truly witty and edifying reproduction of Paul's thoughts, a reproduction that at the same time shapes itself into a brilliant vindication of the Lutheran symbol, especially of the doctrine of the election by grace, as Missouri holds on to it to this day by God's grace. Stöckhardt is in the habit of digging deep, and in this commentary, too, he has understood how to follow carefully the deep thoughts of the apostle and to set before us the gold of divine truth in its genuine splendor. If Stöckhardt's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was the best thing that has appeared on this most distinguished of Paul's writings in recent decades, this is no less true of the splendid gift which he now lays in the lap of the Church in his Epistle to the Ephesians. We promise that anyone who approaches this commentary with leisure and a fresh mind will find it a delight to his faith and a rich benefit to his theology. In typographical terms, too, we have before us a chaste, clean, noble work in every respect, which does all honor to the masters. And only one fault would we call it, that the book costs but $1.25, for no works of such kind and decor are to be had so cheaply, either in America or from Europe. F. B.

**Catechism sermons on the third, fourth, and fifth principal pieces** of C. C. Schmidt. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. price: 85 Cts.

"Five years ago the **Concordia Publishing House** was permitted to present to its customers the first volume of Rev. C. C. Schmidt's 'Catechism Sermons.' The reception which these sermons met with encouraged the esteemed author, who is widely known precisely for his clear grasp, his logical arrangement of the material offered, his lucid rendering, and his succinct presentation of the doctrines of the Catechism, combined with practical applications, to make a continuation of this series of sermons available to the Publishing House. The second volume, which appeared in July, treats of the third to sixth principal parts, and is naturally, in consequence of the anticipations in the first two principal parts, less extensive than the first. It contains 136 pages, measuring 6X9 inches, and is to be obtained, postage paid, at 85 cts. for those who beautifully possess the first volume, bound uniformly with it. The whole book, embracing both parts, costs $2.00 in durable half-fringed binding." on the sixth main piece, the author does not offer any special reflections, but he does (which is not indicated on the title-page) offer three sermons on the Lord's Supper. We would especially recommend the present reflections and sermons to younger pastors inclined to rhetoric and to English pastors. F. B.

**Anthology of characteristic preludes** Among the most common Chorales of the Lutheran Church. Issues 1-13. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo.

This great work of its kind is now published in its entirety in three editions: "Edition H: 13 Heste of approximately 48 pages each. Price: $16.00. Issue 6: 13 Heste, as in Issue H, but in two **Flexible Pebble Cloth- covered bindings**. Price: $12.00 postage paid. Issue 8-. Same as issue 0, but.

In the best **seal-grain leather binding**. Price: H13.50 postage paid." **Concordia Publishing House** says of this anthology, "This collection of preludes comprises 620 pages of neat lithography, each plate about 10l^X7^L inches of music engraving on a sheet area of about 14X11 inches, that is, the size of American '**sheet music,**' only in landscape instead of portrait format. There are 686 preludes, some easy, others less so, and only a few difficult to perform for organists of average talent and skill, but there are always several preludes to the most frequently used chorales. All the pieces have a churchly character, indeed they bear a distinctly Lutheran stamp, without exposing themselves to the accusation of pedantry. Most of them are short, that is, short enough not to lose the essential quality of a prelude, but a few festive preludes are long enough to deserve the name Festvorspiel. Most are taken from the works of tried masters of ecclesiastical organ music, but pleasing samples of recent American Lutheran composers were safely allowed to be included; for we need by no means be ashamed of the achievements of our more distinguished composers." - Every congregation should purchase for its organist this noble and rich work, which has received the most favorable reviews in the ecclesiastical press throughout our country. The committee, as well as the publishing house, the "Kirchenblatt" notes, can be congratulated on this meritorious undertaking. F. B.

**The Revelation of St. John**. The Christian people with simple interpretation presented by Carl Manthey-Zorn. Price: Bound: M. 3.50; Stapled: M. 3.

This is a volume of 406 pages in small octavo. Fr. Zorn's popular and direct style of presentation is well known and also comes to the fore in this explanation of the Revelation of John. He shines brightly into the eyes of the reader and holds the light of truth straight and close in his face. That the reader will not always agree with the given exegesis, e.g. also not with the interpretation of the 20th chapter, does no harm to Zorn's book, since he does not present anything that would be contrary to the analogy of faith. Where would there also be an explanation of Revelation with which all Lutherans would agree on all points? We count this popular interpretation, intelligible to the Christian people, among the best that the indefatigable author has hitherto supplied us with, and hereby warmly recommend it. F. B.

**The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians,** interpreted by Joh. Ph. Köhler. **Northwestern Publishing House**, Milwaukee, Wis. Price: 75 Cts.

That several orthodox commentaries on parts of the Scriptures have already appeared in our midst is quite a pleasing fact. But if all the books of Scripture, or even of the New Testament, are to be treated, which would be very desirable, the exegetes of the Synodal Conference must remain valiantly at work. We therefore welcome the fact that now also Pros. Köhler has come out with the above explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians, and hereby recommend it to our readers for examination and diligent study. Without rich profit they will not put this writing out of their hands.

F. B.

**Handbooklet for the Preparation for Death**, or: Sacred Art of Dying. By Martin Möller. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau i. S. Price: hardcover M. 1.50; stapled: M. 1.20.

This edifying booklet by the excellent preacher and conscientious pastor Martin Moller, who was born in 1547 and died in 1606, will prove to be a right, strong comforter in the hands of afflicted and challenged Christians and will render pastors excellent service in their pastoral care. P. O. Willkomm has published it anew and added a short preface.

**Synodalbericht der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Sachsen u. a. St.** Verlag des Schriftenvereins, Zwickau i. S. Price: M. 1.

This report contains a synodal speech on Is. 1, 8, together with the annual report on the state of the synod by Praeses Kunstmann, the conclusion of the lecture on "Repentance" (Thesis 5: Fruits and Characteristics of Repentance; Thesis 6: Purpose and Use of Repentance), also by Praeses Kunstmann; furthermore, negotiations on the "Reform of Religious Education" demanded by the Zwickau Teachers' Assembly, an excellent work which is also available separately for 49 Pf.; finally, the usual business negotiations. May the report also find many readers in America! F. B.

**Luther album**. By August Lange. **Louis Lange Publishing Co.**, St. Louis, Mo. Price: $1.00.

This writing wants to be a precursor to the jubilee in 1917. The life of Luther is described attractively in 24 chapters. The text is accompanied by the 24 pictures of the Luther Gallery by W. Weimar, as well as the new Luther portrait by K. Astfalk. - From the same publisher we have also received the sixteenth volume of "Blätter und Blüten", which, surpassing its predecessors, is rich in beautiful illustrations and diverse, interesting reading material.

F. B.

**DE LIBERO ARBITRIO DIATRIBE SIVE COLLATIO per Desiderium Erasmum Roterodamum**. Edited by **Lic.** Johannes von Walter, a. o. Professor in Breslau. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 2.80.

This excellent edition of the **Diatribe of** the famous humanist offers from XXXIII (introduction) and 92 pages the Latin text of the Diatribe itself with notes. In the introduction Walter spreads 1. about the origins of the Diatribe, 2. about the editions of the same, 3. about its content and 4. about the dogmatic thoughts of the same. The synergistic thesis which Erasmus seeks to defend against Luther in this writing is: "Liberty is that faculty of the human will by virtue of which man can conform to or turn away from that which leads to eternal salvation." In what respect Erasmus had failed to understand Luther, Walter writes: "Erasmus believes that Luther's religious determinism is primarily a speculative problem of the doctrine of God, whereas this is precisely what is characteristic of Luther, that he takes his starting point in man's inability to do good, that is, in anthropology. The consequence of this inverted conception is that Erasmus is unable to give a right understanding to the religious interests of the Reformers. Faith is scarcely touched upon; indeed, a discussion of the problem of faith is directly rejected, and for the certainty of salvation Erasmus has no understanding at all. One of the reasons why he asserts freedom of the will is: **ut excludatur securitas**. In other places Erasmus shows a little more understanding for Luther's position: he is aware that Luther's doctrine of the unfree will was prompted by a false trust in works, and he does not deny the justification of this motive. But if Erasmus, for his part, thinks that he has avoided this difficulty, it shows how little deeply he has grasped the problem. He thinks that two things must exclude all self-confidence from the works: 1. the reflection from the fact that free will has its capacities for good from God. But from the fact that God has given to free will the possibility of doing good, it does not yet follow that the reality of good may be traced back from God. By the same token, sin might be ascribed from God, since the possibility of it also comes from God. 2. (2) All pride is excluded by the fact that man's action is very small (**perpusillum**) in comparison with God's action in procuring salvation. But that which Erasmus calls **perpusillum** is indeed not something small. For if we also disregard his remarks on the morality of philosophers, the turning to God's grace which Erasmus requires of free will is a

Change of mind, consequently the very thing that matters in the first place. The theory of Erasmus is thus not apt to exclude **arrogantia**. Most alarming is the sentence of Erasmus: **Non enim vult deus, ut homo sibi quicquam tribuat, etiamsi quid esset, quod merito posset sibi tribuere**. This demands that man judge himself incapable of good without actually being so. Erasmus' judgment of Luther thus finally amounts to the vague formula that religious determinism is useful as a standard of self-judgment, possibly also as a means of comforting the timid and rebuking the haughty, but not as a dogmatic theory. " F. B.

**Luther's Small Catechism a gem of the elementary school**. Lecture by Schulrat Bang. Published by Dörffling and Franke. Price: SO Pf.

Especially pedagogues in our time have much reviled Luther's catechism and sought to oust it from the school curriculum, which unfortunately they have also succeeded in doing in many places. This hostility, however, has its sufficient reason neither in pedagogical wisdom nor in concern for the youth, but in religious unbelief, pedagogical lack of understanding, and insufficient knowledge of Luther's Catechism. This is also evident from Bang's lecture, whose. It is a pleasure for every Lutheran to read, although one cannot agree with some of the remarks. Of the second article Bang says: "The Catechism is also delicious in that Luther strikes a personal, subjective, confessional tone in the explanations. When I read the text of the Second Article at home in silence and then Luther's explanation aloud, I feel as if, after the terse report of the facts, a hymn roared up to heaven: This is no longer the language of word alone, but also of sound. The text is objectively reporting - like the language of a Roman writing tablets of law -, the explanation is subjectively testifying, confessing, is Christianity passed into flesh and blood - German (!) Christianity. It sounds like an oath of allegiance, and we hear through its ravishing sound the marching footsteps of the army of millions of believers from nineteen centuries, and we see them marching under the waving panoply of the cross into battle, victory, and peace-and we, too, are drawn into the great, beatific experience of our forefathers and pioneers by a force that cannot be fasted into words! - Who would dare to lay his hand on this consecrated, inherited gem and rob it from coming generations?" F. B.

THE CATECHIST'S HANDBOOK, being also an Exposition of Luther's Small Catechism for Laymen, based on the Catechism of Dr. Theodor Kaftan. By the *Rev. John. W. Horine.* General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Price: 90 Cts.

This book offers an explanation of the Lutheran Catechism with the omission of the section on confession and absolution. The interpretation is kept popular, but does not penetrate particularly deeply into the doctrinal content of the catechism. Nor is the Lutheran doctrine always fully, clearly, sharply, definitely, precisely, and correctly expressed, e. g., in the section on Sunday (p. 24), on obedience in the church (p. 32), on the judgment of unjust war (p. 39), on knowledge and faith (p. 69), on the descent into hell (p. 96), on the resurrection (p. 97), and in other points (pp. 109. 125. 135). F. B.

Children's Catechism for School and Church. By **Lic.** A. Eckert. G. Strübig's publishing house, Leipzig.

From 119 pages this book treats the first and second main piece of the Small Catechism. In the preface the author says that theologically he is on the side of the "old faith", but in the method of presentation he is a "modern man". What this means, and how this treatment of the Catechism is to be judged theologically and pedagogically, we will discuss as soon as we have received the presentation of the following main pieces. F. B.

**The Scientific Foundations of the Christian Worldview**. A contribution to the solution of the doubts and concerns of our time. For preachers, teachers and educated readers by P. Dr. Karl Nebel. Published by Karl Meyer, Berlin.

By Christian world-view Dr. Nebel understands the doctrine that there is a personal God and a special realm of the moral and spiritual, and from the idealism of Kant Nebel then combats the atheistic monism of Häckel and other like-minded people. F. B.

**Hegel. An overview of his world of thought in excerpts from his works**. Compiled and provided with an introduction by Georg Lasson. Published by Robert Lutz in Stuttgart. Price: M. 2.50.

In his own words, in this book of 300 pages in small octavo, Hegel has his say on all kinds of topics and questions of his pantheistic, panlogistic philosophy, which was universally admired and idolized at the beginning of the last century and which has not remained without influence even on the speculative theologians of the Lutheran Church. F. B.

**Emerson. His character from his works**. Edited and translated by Dr. Egon Fridell. Published by Robert Lutz in Stuttgart.

This volume of 280 pages in small octavo offers 181 quotations from the witty (admittedly by no means always in the good sense of the word) writings of the American idealist Emerson under the following headings: To the Reader; Illusions; Mental Powers; Realist, Idealist, and Skeptic; World Laws; Self-Reliance; Truth; Work; Nature; The World Soul; Love; Development; Faith; Daily Life; Intercourse; Friendship; Feats of Action; Fate; Age; Education; Travel; Courage; Beauty; Art; Great Men; Equalization. F. B.

**The Ideal of Humanity in Goethe's "Faust" and Hauptmann's "Sunken Bell"**. Lecture given to friends of the Gütersloh High School by Lic. H. Sogemeier. Published by C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh. Price: 80 Ps.

In this witty and highly interesting lecture (70 pages) Sogemeier proves that the representatives of Nietzsche's doctrine of the superman with his "amoral, alogical psychologism", which Hauptmann glorifies in his drama "The Sunken Bell", wrongly refer to Goethe, who in his "Faust" also knows this doctrine of the superman, but rejects it as animal subhumanity. Admittedly, Sogemeier also goes overboard when he finds at least rudiments of Christianity in Goethe's "Faust" and says of Goethe, for example: "The fact that antiquity has no trace of faith was the reason that this ideal world remained foreign to him (Goethe) in his innermost being, and he felt tremendously drawn to the native soil of the Christian world." Goethe in fine "Faust," as Sogemeier rightly remarks, is a "genuine heathen," and it is precisely "genuine" heathenism, and not merely "rotten" heathenism, that is the opposite of Christianity, and not, as Sogemeier seems to think, a sort of preliminary stage of it. F. B.

**C. Bertelsmanns Verlag in Gütersloh** sent us:

1. "Silent Bright Hours" by Th. Schmalenbach. First volume. Seventh Edition. Price:M. 1; hardback: M. 1.20.

2. "**Sancta Sanctis**." "The Holy to the Saints." A confession and communion book for confirmands and for everyone. By J. Lortzing. (50 Ps.)

**The publishing house of the Lutheran Book Society in Elberfeld** has sent us:

3. he last day." Lecture delivered on February 2, 1881, in the Lutheran Vereinshaus at Leipzig, by R. Rocholl. Second edition. (80 Ps.)

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**The Swedish Augustana Synod** celebrated its fiftieth anniversary with much splendor at Rock Island, III, from June 5 to 15. In 1860, the year of its foundation, this synod numbered 49 congregations, 5000 communicants, and 27 pastors, and now 1092 congregations, 611 pastors, and 405 parochial schools, with 18,793 children and 548 teachers. Participating in the celebration from Sweden were Bishop von Schéele and his wife and the **Rector magnificus of** Upsala, from the General Council Schmauck, Jacobs and Haas, from the General Synod Judge Großcup, from the United Norwegian Synod Praeses Rasmussen and other representatives of synods and teaching institutions. Governor Eberhardt, an alumnus of Gustav Adolf College, also attended the celebration. Festive greetings had arrived from, among others, President Taft, King Gustav of Sweden, Upsala and Lund Universities, the Swedish-American Society in Stockholm, the Swedish poet Selma Lagerlof, and the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference. The Jubilee Synod was opened by D. Norelius with a sermon on Matt. 16:13-20. His theme was, "The self-examination to which our Jubilee exhorts us: 1. Are we as a Synod truly built upon the rock Christ? 2. In spite of all the power of hell, do we still stand fully upon that rock today?" Drs. Schmauck and Norelius were conferred the degree of **LL. D**. As an anniversary gift the Swedes raised 8275,000. And for the library building donated by the Denkmann family, valued at $200,000, Bishop von Schéele gave his library in his will. For missionary purposes the Swedish Women's Missionary Society has raised $12,000. The Ohio "Church Gazette" writes: "D. Richter, President of the Iowa Synod, also attended the celebration. He writes very enthusiastically of the fellowship of faith and church which was expressed: This was an uplifting service. So the joy went through our hearts, our Lutheran Church is not so divided as it seems; only the opportunity to give visible and tangible expression to unity is lacking. Here, after all, a very large part of our church was represented and celebrated in a moving manner an act of church fellowship; for we were not gathered here for a meeting to congratulate the Swedish brethren on their jubilee, but for a festive service. . . . Should this not give us joy to come together and officially establish such church fellowship, to draw its consequences, and to build shoulder to shoulder our Lutheran Zion? The common worship in the festival hall at Rock Island looks to us like a beautiful spring day promising summer.'" Without unionism, the celebration at Rock Island is unlikely to be lousy. But that every one who was present there thereby already **eo ipso** professed or wished to profess his communion of faith and church with all the festive guests, does not follow. F. B.

**Lodge Question in the General Council**. In the ***Lutheran*** (p. 628) a reader asks the question whether the Council was consistent in forbidding Lodge membership to its pastors and permitting it to the laity. The answer of the ***Lutheran***

reads: "The Synod has the right to make laws for its ministers, for they are the Church's spiritual teachers and shepherds; it would be false to Christ if it would allow its ministers to join a society that dishonors or discredits His holy name. The congregation makes the laws governing its members; the right of discipline rests with the congregation and no one else. If the Synod had the same authority over the laymen as it has over the clergymen, it would be compelled to discipline every church member who belongs to an oath-bound society, or to one that purposely excludes from its ritual the name of Christ. But since it has no such power, all that it can do is to urge upon its congregations to eliminate, by educational processes, all oath-bound, Christ-despising elements." Of course, a synod cannot and should not discipline individual members of a congregation, but it can discipline congregations that stubbornly adhere to false lodge practices. A synod which disciplines its pastors *in regard to the* Lodge, but in principle lets its congregations practice as they wish, is, however, inconsistent, and its discipline against Lodge pastors will not be far off in the long run. And is the Council now really serious everywhere in the matter of lodges, even only with its pastors, with whom, however, the judgment must begin? The news passed through several church papers some time ago that of the 13 pastors received at Reading, Pa. as "Nobles of the Mystic Shrine," three belonged to the Pennsylvania ministry. Since at the same time the Pennsylvania Ministry held a fine meeting and the three "Lutheran" Mystic Shriners were also present, the matter made no small stir before the world, and the Pennsylvania Ministry decided to remind the three pastors that the Constitution did not permit pastors to belong to secret societies and to investigate the matter. Now, the 8briners constitute a peculiarly high degree of Masons, and as far as is known, this degree can only be attained after several years of Masonic membership. It has been asked, therefore, why has not the ministry of Pennsylvania taken earlier steps against the ministers who have now become Mystic Shriners in such a challenging, humiliating, and publicly offensive manner to the Lutheran Church? Has the Pennsylvania Ministry done its duty in the past to these 8briner pastorsu? And since this is a public nuisance, and the whole Lutheran Church is affected by the position which the Council takes towards the Lodges, it should also be publicly announced how and with what success, or results, the resolutions passed against the Shriner-Pastors have been carried out. Will this be done? We wish the officials of the General Council and of the Pennsylvania Ministry Christian courage and Lutheran firmness in this regard. F. B.

**General Council and General Lutheran Conference**. The "A. E. **I.** K." writes: "In No. 7 of the "Theologische Zeitblatt" one could read: The American General Council publishes a major theological journal, *The Lutheran Church Review,* edited by Prof. D. theol. Schmauck in Philadelphia. In the first quarterly of 1910, the editor writes in an article: "New Rationalism and Lutheranism in Germany" among other things: "The General Conference has abandoned its original confessional standpoint and has taken a line

with the Uniate State Church." We do not know whether this grave untruth was really uttered by D. Schmauck. For every word of it is false. The General Evangelical Lutheran Conference stands exactly on the former "confessional standpoint"; men like Professors Ewald, Ihmels, Walther, Zahn, or such outspoken old leaders of the Lutheran confession as D. Bard do not change their confession like a dress. Equally false is the assertion that the Conference "has placed itself in line with the Uniate State Church." It has no ecclesiastical task at all, and never has had, for it has no mandate to do so. But a confessional task it does have, and to rally all who rally around the Lutheran confession is its high purpose. That is why she has reached out to the Lutherans in Prussia, and rightly so. The Union itself still deplores it as an injury to the pure confession, and seeks on its part to do its utmost to remove the evils arising from it and to prevent its advance/ " The General Lutheran Conference, to which the General Council has hitherto belonged, was, as "Lehre und Wehre" has repeatedly shown, unionistic from the beginning, and that in many respects, and especially with reference to its position in relation to the Association Lutherans. If, therefore, the Council does not wish to condemn its previous position, it is impossible to see why, so far as its conviction of principle is concerned, it should not remain so even after the admission of the Association Lutherans into the Lutheran Conference. If one does not reject all unionism on principle as a sin Against God's Word, even the question whether to allow a somewhat greater quantum of unionism can no longer be strictly a matter of conscience, but only of expediency. The ***Lutheran Church Review*** has identified himself with the "Lutheran Covenant," which, however, is also nothing less than unionism-free. F. B.

**The Lutheran** writes of the **National Missionary Congress** in Chicago, which drew about 4,200 delegates from all the states of the Union: "**It was interdenominational, but the Methodists were most in evidence, as they have been all through the series of conventions.**" The watchwords were, "**The evangelization of the world in our generation;" "an every-member-canvass;" "a weekly offering for missions**." Primarily from the General Synod and General Council, it seems, came the Lutherans, who, according to the ***Lutheran***'s report, were also present; D. Kähler of the General Council also gave a lecture to the assembly. Unionism does not seem to be seen by the Lutherans of the General Council in this ecclesiastical communion with the sects. According to the ***Lutheran***, (p. 632) two representatives of the General Council were also present in Edinburgh at the **World's Missionary Conference,** Drach and Horn. The specifically refers to these two as "**our representatives**" and prints p. 650: "**Diverse creeds and various organizations, despite their differences, have found that to obey the last command of the great Head of the Church and to insure the triumph of the cross is a matter of common interest to all Christendom.**" Will not the readers of the ***Lutheran*** understand this to mean that common cause may be made with the sects in missions? F- B.

**Galesburg Rule.** In a review of D. Späth's writing, "**Charles Porterfield Krauth,**" the ***Lutheran Observer*** (p. 860) says, "**The account**

**here given of the inward struggles by which Dr. Krauth finally arrived at the Galesburg Rule is not calculated to beget additional confidence in the legitimacy of the Rule itself. If it so manifestly 'accords with the Word of God and with the Confessions of our Church,' there is at least an element of mystery in the great travail of mind and heart and soul that preceded recognition and acceptance of it. Its enunciation raised a storm of protest in the General Council, and men like Drs. Seiss, Krotel, Harkey, Kunkleman, Hill, and others were vigorous in their challenge of the new departure; nor were they ever convinced by Dr. Krauth's reason ings on the subject**. " Also here the ***Observer*** takes a stand for D. J. A. Brown against Krauth. Of a real break with the old lax position of the General Synod in doctrine and practice, the ***Lutheran Observer still*** seems to know nothing.

F. B.

**In the "Zion Messenger" D. Neve writes about Wittenberg College in Springfield, O.**: "The Carnegie matter is settled. Readers know that Carnegie created a pension fund for retired college profes- sions, but with the provision that only '**non-sectarian colleges**' should be considered. That was then a matter of what the '**non-sectarian'** meant. Wittenberg College does not exclude students of other church denominations from instruction. And while, however, the actual professorships in the college are and always will be filled only by Lutherans, it has had occasional non-Lutherans in the preschool among the changing '**instructors**' in subjects such as arithmetic, drawing, rhetoric, music, mostly former students from the city, as it happened. But Carnegie demands a thoroughly interdenominational school, above all a mixed authority; he wants that in all subjects the teachers be employed without distinction of denomination, that denominational influence be eliminated from the school. Wittenberg could not agree to this and was therefore removed from the list. Wittenberg's authority consists exclusively of Lutherans. Their professor of Latin came to us from the Missourian Norwegians, and is still Missourian; the professor of Greek came from the United Norwegians, and joined the Ohio congregation here at the place; one of their German professors is a member of the General Council, and serves a congregation of the Council besides his teaching; their professor of English language and literature is a child of D. Wenner's congregation in New York, etc." Whether President Hechert and Hefelbower signed the writing communicated in "Lehre und Wehre," p. 226 ff. or not, is not evident from the above. However, an explanation of this should not be omitted.

F. B.

**"The Promise"** which Protestants in intermarriages with Catholics must sign reads in New Dort: "**I, the undersigned, being desirous of contracting marriage with . . before a Catholic priest duly authorized by a special dispensation from His Grace, the Archbishop of New York, do promise in presence of the Reverend Father . . . and of . . . witness attending for that purpose, that all the children born of my marriage with . . . shall be baptized and educated in the Catholic religion, and moreover, that I will by no means whatsoever hinder or obstruct the said . . . in the exercise of the said religion. I also promise that in the solemnization of my marriage there shall be only the Catholic ceremony. In testi-**

**mony whereof I have signed this document in presence of Reverend . . . and the said witness ... on this.. . . day of the month of ... 19** . ." That a Protestant cannot make such a shameful promise, by which he sacrifices his own flesh and blood to Moloch, should not need to be proved. In the ***Converted Catholic of*** 1909 O'Connor says: "**But I say that no man has a right to give a writing that his children shall be brought up in the faith of a Church the doctrines of which are not good enough for him to believe in himself. No man of honor would seriously think of doing such a thing for a moment.** " F. B.

## II. Abroad.

**In Hesse, in** addition to the congregations which had united under the name "Independent Lutheran Church in the Hessian Lands" and which have been in communion with the Lutheran Free Church in Prussia for some time, there were so-called "renitent" congregations which were again divided among themselves. A settlement has now been reached between a part of these congregations and the Independent Lutheran Church in Hesse, so that they henceforth grant each other pulpit and communion fellowship. It is the aforementioned part of the renitent congregations which, in April of this year in Hanover, at the request of the Independent Lutheran Church in Hesse, was admitted to the Delegates' Convention of German Lutheran Free Churches.

This year also marks the centenary of Hofmann's birth, and at the Nuremberg Festival Father Müller gave a lecture on his "Significance for the Development of the Protestant Principle of Scripture", with the following main points: "1. Hofmann's work can be seen as an attempt to preserve the content of the old dogmatic doctrine of Scripture, even if, like Hofmann himself, one has learned to understand Scripture as a book that came into being under certain historical conditions and was conditioned by them. (2) V. Hofmann wants to teach the statement that the testimony contained in Scripture - which he has just presented with great emphasis as a unity - is true, as an u priori judgment. His thoughts consequently lead to the statement that the Old and New Testament canon is the doctrinal norm being understood as an **a posteriori** statement of faith. His method of developing the statement of faith from the self-testimony of the one who has been born again, and of placing it alongside the testimony of Scripture, arises from the correct principle of determining the scope of faith from its center, but requires a bending by means of which faith is expressed from the outset as one wrought by Scripture." To put it more clearly: Hofmann rapturously substitutes his own subjective ego for the objective Scripture. F. B.

**When the "pastoral letter" of D. v.** Bezzel was censured at the Bavarian Tax Synod, Bezzel declared, according to the "H. P. K.": "If a freedom of doctrine were allowed to penetrate our church, if even the most immature subjectivism were allowed to be carried to market, if our congregations had to be the **corpus vile on** which the most inexperienced were allowed to dissect, then the worst service would be done to them and to the church regime. One cannot and must not expect him to withdraw even one iota from the circular. He stands on the whole

Tenor of the Confession with all that he is and is able. He would continue to meet the least and simplest vicar with all kindness and goodness, but he would never allow our church to become a lecture hall where opinions are carried back and forth, and the congregation stands by and bleeds to death. . . . From the truth which he knew, and which he invoked, and which saved him through, he would not depart unto death!" Very beautiful! But, as a matter of fact, the Bavarian State Church has long since become such a "speaking hall," in which the liberals, under the leadership of Geyer and Rittelmeyer, openly, unabashedly, criticizing Bezzel and virtually challenging him, make known their views. "Finally a man!" exclaims the "Reformation" with reference to Bezzel's anti-liberal rallies. But from words D. Bezzel must then also move to deeds and see to it that the liberals are expelled from the Bavarian State Church. Deeds show the man. We are waiting for such deeds from Bezzel. F. B.

**The Saxon Minister of Culture, D. Beck, has** spoken out about religious instruction in the elementary school to the effect that religious instruction in accordance with Scripture and the confession should be maintained. In his statement it says: "When at the Zwickau meeting a speaker, who was received with special applause, said: 'It is a sacred duty of conscience for the patriotic teachers to contribute in their part to the preservation of the religious sense of our people. We believe in this source of strength and consolation, in this greatest protection of our people.' If, furthermore, in the opinion of the teachers, the person of JEsu is to stand in the center of religious instruction and the mind of JEsu is to be made alive in the child, then one can only agree with this goal if one has a correct understanding of it. But how do we know the significance of JEsu's personality and his attitude? But only from his words handed down to us in the Bible, to which he gave the promise: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' It is inadmissible then to accept arbitrarily only some of his words, but to reject the others. Either he was the one he professed to be in his words, the Son of God and the Saviour and Redeemer who died for us, and this is our and our Christian Church's unbreakable faith. Then we also have the duty, in the light of these words of his, to bring him near to the youth in religious instruction. Or if he had not been the person he professed to be, his person could never have been the focus of religious instruction and his attitude could never have been brought to life in children. Therefore, we must hold fast to the scriptural and confessional religious instruction, but in doing so, with an understanding improvement of the teaching method, while avoiding a rigid, dead dogmatism as well as a powerless vagueness, our Christian religion must be imparted to our children in a lively way that deepens it. When a Saxon school bulletin stated in this connection: 'The goal of keeping Jesus alive in the child is, however, too vague for the positive, but too narrow for those of the outermost wing. In our opinion every man can agree with him, whether he be a believer in God or an atheist, provided he is only idealistic, so we must reject an all-world religion for our children that is possible even to an atheist." For the time being, therefore, everything will remain the same, but also the

Liberal teachers will continue their work of havoc among the youth, for even D. Beck is not remotely thinking of. F. B.

The pastors in Saxony have now also taken a stand on **the demands of the liberal teachers.** The "Alte Glaube" (Old Faith) writes: "The Saxon clergy, which otherwise unfortunately also contains strong contrasts, has recently taken a stand in pleasing unanimity on the reform of religious instruction in the elementary school demanded by the teachers. A petition of the pastors' association to the Ministry of Culture was first submitted to all conferences and was accepted by them almost unanimously. This petition demands that the most noble task of religious education should continue to be that the children be taught to answer correctly the highest and last question, which is also understandable to the child: "What must I do to be saved?and that this instruction is to take place on the basis of the Gospel of Christ, as it is contained in Holy Scripture and made known by our Evangelical Lutheran Church, especially in Luther's popular Small Catechism; Further, that religious instruction be given in all school years, that Luther's Small Catechism remain in force as proven educational material for all religious instruction, namely for the upper grades in special lessons, and that, as before, the main sections of the Lutheran Small Catechism be taught, if necessary with reductions in the third, fourth and fifth main sections, and a not too meager selection of core verses and hymnal songs. Finally, it is demanded that only such teachers be entrusted with religious instruction, or be left in it, who declare that, on the basis of their religious vows, they wish to give it in a confessional manner. In addition, it is urgently desired that the parents of the regional church be granted the right to choose religious instruction for their children outside the school in accordance with their convictions, if the ecclesiastical supervision of religious instruction should be abolished, and that the training of capable religious teachers in the seminaries be ensured, also by appointing clergymen from the practical office as seminary teachers, and that everything be avoided in the seminaries which goes beyond the purpose of the elementary school and which could impair the willingness and professionalism of the elementary school teachers."

**A deputy of the "German Teachers' Association" at Berlin** declared before the Saxon Teachers' Association at Dresden: "The German teaching fraternity knows how to thank its Saxon comrades-in-arms vividly for having taken up this necessary and for the long run unavoidable struggle with fresh initiative and earnest determination, and it follows with eagerness every further step on the thorny path of victory which the Saxon teaching fraternity has embarked upon in the hope that the successes of their laborious pioneer work will in the not too distant future also be of benefit to the entire German elementary school." A liberal, anti-clerical spirit also prevailed at the German Teachers' Congress in Strasbourg, to which about 5000 teachers had gathered. One speaker declared: "Above all, the clergy must be removed from the school, who understand nothing of the elementary school. " F. B.

The teachers of Dresden's secondary schools have declared themselves **against co-education.** In a petition to the chambers of the estates, they demand the fundamental rejection of communal education, which should at most be permitted as an exception in smaller towns, and write in justification of this view: "Education and instruction should lead the male and female sexes to the goal based on their own characteristics. This goal is different for the male sex than for the female. Community education makes it impossible to take into account the characteristics of the sexes and thus precludes the attainment of the above-mentioned goal. The value of teaching is considerably impaired by community education, because individual subjects (religion, German, history, science) require, for educational reasons, a different choice of material and treatment for the different sexes. In such cases, communal instruction must lead to cursing. In particular, the moral dangers inevitably associated with community education are not to be minimized, especially in our time. Even conscientious supervision will not be able to exclude them completely. On the other hand, individual advantages of coeducation, which cannot be ignored, cannot be given decisive weight."

**What Theodor Kaftan understands by Lutheranism, the** "Th. Zbl." of the Lutheran Federation writes: "In the 'Allg.Luth. Kirchenztg.', No. 7 and 8, he (Kaftan) has published an essay: 'Der springende Punkt', and in it it says: 'Not a few Lutherans see in Lutheranism a closed entity, which in unity and unity competes with the Roman Church, which, although a certain diversity is admitted, is nevertheless determined by a uniform theology. The contemporary theology of the Lutheran Reformation, which has found its fine expression in the Formula of Concord, is regarded by them as Lutheran theology, and every deviation from it as a deviation from Lutheranism. Convinced that they possess not only the eternal truth, but also the invariably correct understanding of it, they regard everything that the progressive development entails essentially as apostasy, as a game of fools, which should and may be left to them, since one thing always eats up the other. According to this characteristic of Lutheranism, which we also represent, tells us. Kaftan, wherein now he and his friends see Lutheranism: 'Lutheranism is to them a greater thing than a theology once fixed, a spiritual power born of the depths of the Gospel, which is far too mighty to be exhausted in a theology of the time.' 'Lutheranism is from its origin the principle of progress; it unites with radical freedom from all that came from men, the bondage in God's Word, the rooting in eternal truth. But all true progress grows out of the union of deep bondage with radical freedom.' 'We sense human development, we recognize the course of history, and thus in depth the step of Him who sits in the regiment. Therefore, what is commanded of us is not to close ourselves off, but to close ourselves off, this, that we enter into this progress of development, to serve it in this, living under it: that is, to represent in it the treasure which is given to us by God in the Lutheran Confession.'" Like Kaftan, R. Seeberg, who stands

liturgist for the "last orthodox Lutheran". But if Seeberg knew what really genuine Lutheranism is, he would also deny Öttingen the above censure. F. B.

**The position of the Anglican Church in England in** relation to the Anglican clergy in the colonies presents many difficulties. The English Church regards itself as a Catholic one, and therefore desires to unite its clergy in a manner similar to that in which the Roman Catholic clergy are under the Pope. Hence the recently elected Archbishop of Sydney, an Englishman by birth, had to sign a lapel before fine consecration, that he was subordinate to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primate of the realm. In Australia it had already been felt disagreeably that the Archbishop of Sydney was not chosen from the Australian clergy, but sent there by England. When, however, the fact of the signed Reversal became known, the Primate of New Zealand addressed an address to his General Synod, declaring it improper for an independent Church to submit to the supremacy of the Church of another country, but that it would be an act of ecclesiastical impropriety for the Archbishop of Canterbury to require a declaration of submission from the Archbishop of another country before consecration. Nevertheless, in the churches of the colonies there seems to be a growing feeling of belonging to the Church of the mother country; the Anglican Church is there also the bearer of the so-called imperialistic idea. (A. E. L. K.)

**The third World Missions Conference** met in Edinburgh from 14 to 23 June. There were 1200 delegates from 160 Protestant denominations, 400 from England, 600 from America, and 180 from the missionary societies of mainland Europe. King George V wrote a letter welcoming the meeting and expressing the hope that the proceedings would be a means of promoting unity among Christians and the high purposes of the conference. Roosevelt had sent a letter expressing his joy that Christians of all denominations were gathered in Edinburgh to discuss together the heathen mission, which still had such tremendous tasks before it. In a brilliant speech W. J. Bryan orally stated that it was the duty of the Christian nations to come to the aid of the non-Christian in their educational task, and to the missionary schools he expressed his highest appreciation from his own observation. The letter of the Roman Bishop Bonomelli of Cremona, Italy, who expressed his joy that religious freedom now reigned in the world (also in Spain and Portugal? F. B.), and that those gathered in Edinburgh were united with him in the faith in Christ the Redeemer, had a surprising effect. How Pius X, who had recently raged so shamefully not only against the Methodists but against all Protestants, could allow or even instruct a bishop to address such a letter to a large Protestant assembly, at which, moreover, the Methodists were particularly well represented, remained a mystery to many. It would not be thought that it was in the interests of the Romanists to cloud and confuse the Protestant judgment of the papacy. Among the most distinguished personalities of the conference were the chairman and secretary of the assembly, D. Mott, and D. Speer....

Both have become more sober over the years, also with reference to their slogan: "Evangelize the world in this generation!" Numerous lectures were delivered, which are to be published in nine volumes and distributed throughout Christendom. The "Old Faith" writes: "The climax of the whole meeting is designated as the day on which it was decided to establish a permanent Missionary Committee. This decision was prompted by the theme: 'Cooperation from the Mission Field.' In the negotiations it was expressly emphasized that the differences existing between the special confessions were not to be denied, that rather each church community, the English High Church as well as that of the Plymouth Brethren, must hold and represent its special doctrines; but nevertheless the earnest striving of all must be to bring to representation among the heathen the one holy Catholic (that is, general) Church. Even the permanent international missionary committee appointed should have nothing to do with confessional and constitutional questions of the various churches and missions, but should be only a general authority for the whole evangelical mission." To the evangelical Christians of the garden world the Edinburgh Conference gave this to consider: "The next ten years will in all probability constitute a turning point in the history of the world; they will be of more decisive importance to the direction of the spiritual development of mankind than centuries in the ordinary course of things. If these years are not utilized, a harm will be done which centuries cannot repair. If, on the other hand, they are well used, they will be among the most glorious in Christian history. But for this we need above all a deeper awareness of our responsibility before Almighty God, who has entrusted to us the great task of evangelizing the world. This task is by no means entrusted in a special way to our missionaries, to the missionary societies, or to us as members of this Conference. It is entrusted to each member of the family of God, and it is entrusted to each member of the Christian Church, just as it is entrusted to the elementary virtues of the Christian life: faith, love, hope. If you are a Christian, you also share in this task. We all recognize this principle; but we must be awakened to carry it out in an entirely new measure. . . . But this spirit is required not only of individuals, nor of congregations; it is a pressing demand that our national life be Christianized as a whole. God demands of us all a new life with more zeal and self-denial than before." The "Reformation" writes: "What brought the conference together, and gave it an earnest expression, was the universally shared conviction that the world clock showed a destiny hour for missions. Never have conditions been so favorable for the evangelization of the world as now. The situation resembles, **mutatis mutandis, that which** Paul found when he conquered the Greco-Roman world for JEsus Christ. The intercourse of the world brings about a fusion and a merging of the most diverse cultures. Orient and Occident open their treasures to each other. Great peoples move out of centuries of isolation. European-American culture begins to assert itself everywhere. Much that had survived in the field of pagan religions is crumbling. Economic, political, social crises

are pushing for a reorganization of religious life as well. In Central Africa Islam is advancing with uncanny speed. The near future will decide the religious destiny of countless African tribes. All these moments make the most urgent appeal to Christianity to become more conscious of its missionary duty than ever before. Thus the conference was under the uplifting and thrilling impression, on the one hand, that it is great harvest time, and, on the other, under the sense of grave responsibility that the present hour holds irretrievable opportunities, the exploitation or neglect of which is vital to the spread of Christianity throughout the world, so far as men can see at all."

F. B.

**Revolt against the Pope in Spain.** While the Romanists in Germany, England and America seem also to advocate religious freedom, the clerics in Spain demand the suppression of Protestants and absolute freedom for Catholicism and 'its orders. And likewise stands Pius X and Merry del Val, who forgive the Spanish government everything but the free exercise of religion recently allowed by it to Protestants. Already in 1871 the Spanish Republican Constitution had granted general freedom of religion without any restriction. But Pope and priest did not rest until the monarchical constitution of 1876 made the provision that only the Papist state religion was allowed to appear "publicly." By virtue of this provision, all non-Catholics had hitherto been forbidden to affix anything externally (inscriptions, pictures, notices, etc.) to the walls of their churches or cemeteries by which they testified to their faith and identified themselves as a church. An Anglican chapel, for example, had to remove the inscription "**Christus redemptor aeternus**" in 1893, and the chapel itself could only be used on condition that the double-winged doorway facing the street remained closed and only the small side door was used as an entrance and exit. The Liberals, however, made progress in Spain also. Two years ago Moret demanded free exercise of religion, and now Canalejas has permitted the Protestants also to enter into public with their worship by "outward signs," and to mark their places of worship with crosses, inscriptions, etc. But who protests against this change is the Pope with his scales, who now in many Protestant countries, especially in America, hypocritically pose as the actual founders and representatives of religious liberty. Where the Romanists are in the minority, they praise toleration and religious liberty; but where, as in Spain and Portugal, they have the reins in their hands, they seek to press the Protestants with their worship into corners and dungeons. But that the papal yoke and the priestly tyranny mean neither honor nor blessing for Spain, King Alfonso now seems to see, for the revision of the Concordat with the Vatican planned by Canalejas he too has given his consent. Canalejas demands 1. restriction of the numerous convents which are draining the people; 2. taxation of all orders which carry on business; 3. full religious liberty for Protestants and all non-Catholics. The maintenance of the Papal Church costs the Spanish State nearly $9,000,000 annually, but for the time being even Canalejas does not dare to think of full religious equality and thus denationalization of the Roman Church and abolition of the above tax. So even if Canalejas carries through his plans, the Romanists remain in the bosom of the state.

sit, and the Protestants can take care of themselves. After the bitter experiences which the Pope has had in France, one would think that he would gladly accept the reforms of the Spanish government, which are relatively advantageous to him. But the Pope does not want to give up a shred of his previous privileges and advantages, and is resentful to such an extent that official relations between the Vatican and the Spanish Government have already been broken off. In particular he protests against the religious liberty granted to the Protestants. But where is there a country in Europe where the Pope has not protested, at least at the last, against the permission of the authorities for Protestant worship? But it seems that the Pope in Spain wants to go to extremes in order to realize the Syllabus of Pius IX. The means he uses are the same as before..: lies and violence. The clerics are openly threatening revolution and rebellion, so that the government has already had to resort to special measures to keep the peace. And as was the case in France some years ago, so now the Catholic press of the whole world is crying out about Diocletianic persecution of the Pope and his Church in Spain. According to the Roman view, everyone persecutes the pope who does not let him do what he wants in fine tyranny and selfishness. If Spain refuses to imprison the Protestants any longer, to torture them, to burn them, and to force them into hidden corners, this is, in the eyes of the papists, persecution of the pope and favoring of the sects. ***Freeman's Journal of*** New York therefore calls it also the action of Canaleja as "**favoring non-Catholic sects**" and sees in it "**an international conspiracy against the Catholic Church, which has spread from France to Spain**". As in France, so also in Spain the Freemasons and **infidels were to** blame for all misfortunes, who were only concerned with spreading Voltaire's religion and making the Roman Church the slave of the state. The independent coexistence of Church and State is not known to the papists, or at least only as a transitory state. For them there is always only the question: who is to be slave and who mistress, the Church or the State? And as far as Voltaire's religion is concerned, the very manifest unbelief and atheism in Italy, France, and Spain is a direct fruit of the Papacy. Even Machiavelli said that from Rome to atheism there was a straight road. A papist educated by Jesuits, to whom history, reason and his own experience, not God's Word and the Gospel, have opened his eyes to the Roman priestly deception, seems, however, to be left only with the alternative of bitter enmity against all ecclesiasticism or even atheism. Protestantism has long since been eliminated for such papists as a conglomerate of folly and impiety by the torrent of lies and calumnies which papists like Janssen, Majunke, and Pius X have poured for centuries upon the Gospel and its confessors. In Spain there are now about 30,000 non-Catholics and about 200 Protestant churches with 7000 members and 100 schools. God forbid that the Antichrist should again deprive these small groups of the liberty now granted them! F. B.

**According to the Revista Christiana, edited by Fr. Fliedner, in** December 1909 there were 5500 children in Protestant schools in Spain. The clerics seek to destroy these schools, but the government and

the anti-clerical press now stands up for freedom. The ***Revista*** writes: "When, at the end of February, the Protestant school in Ibahernando (Prov. of the Sea) was closed by the clerics against the provisions of the law, the Minister of Public Instruction, the Count of Romanones, immediately took up the cause and ordered by telegraph in vigorous terms the immediate reopening of the school. The liberal press of Madrid also warmly defended the cause of liberty and demanded that the Protestant school be reopened."

**Roman religious orders and economic life**. The conditions in Italy vividly show the damage that Roman religious orders can do to the economic life of a country. There, businessmen face fierce competition from the fact that many monasteries trade heavily in wax, chocolate, liquor, etc., without being taxed by the state. But even greater damage is done by the nunneries that run inns and work in the linen, clothing, and jewelry industries. For once they care neither for the tax collector nor for the factory inspector, then they work far more cheaply than any other business, because they have labourers at their disposal who are paid very little or not at all. But very special disadvantage arises to Italian business life from the millions which are invested by the monasteries under false names in real estate in the largest cities. In this way the monasteries not only strengthen their position of economic power, but also contribute to the building crisis, to the increase in the price of rents, and to the rise in the price of food, damages which are already becoming alarmingly apparent in large cities such as Rome, Milan, Florence. This is easily explained when one considers that in Rome, for example, more than half of all land is owned by the "dead hand." - That even insightful Catholics do not blindly pass by these damages is shown by the example of the Viennese prelate Scheicher, who in the "Correspondence Gazette for the Catholic Clergy in Austria," referring to the Spanish monastic economy, says: "I once wrote that penal house work and monastic work were equally dangerous for the earning conditions. One took it amiss here and there. I stand by it, however. If the State or the religious enthusiasm of the people makes a contribution to the undertakings of some, then production can naturally be cheaper there than in undertakings which are entirely self-supporting and have to pay old-age and invalidity pensions. Competition, therefore, is not given in the case of equal distribution of light and air. Envy and discontent arise, and in the end even religious people rejoice when the anarchists remove from their path those who have proved inconvenient as competitors. It was ideal when the monks once cultivated wildernesses, the Troglodytes taught agriculture and cattle-breeding; it is ideal when Benedictines, Carthusians, etc., do the same today in wild Africa; but in the cultivated Christian country I like it when the clergy take more account of the saying: 'My kingdom is not of this world,' even in the sphere of industry and economy, than when they represent acquisitive cooperatives in spiritual garb."

(Th. B.)

**King Leopold and "Baroness" Baughan**. The conduct of the alleged "Baroness" Vaughan, **rectius** Mademoiselle Karoline Delacroix, the former friend of the late King Leopold, has caused the Belgian Re-

The government was prompted to submit to Parliament the list of those persons who were ennobled by King Leopold in the last years of his reign, in order to publish this list in the Adelsblatte. From this list, however, there is neither the alleged Baroness Vaughan nor her children, who are still referred to as Dukes, or Grasen, by some newspapers. It is thus proved that Mademoiselle Delacroix either never received a title of nobility, or did so under circumstances which have no force of law. The weathering of a title of nobility cannot, therefore, be allowed either to her or to her sons. It is the same with the alleged "morganatic" marriage of the same. It is now fully established that no marriage ceremony ever took place, not even at the deathbed of the old monarch, and that the whole legend was invented only to justify before the Catholic population the granting of the last sacraments and absolution to a king who had manifestly lived in adultery. Then, of course, the Catholic clergy of Belgium appears in an exceedingly sad light. (E. K. Z.)

**One fruit of the religionless, atheistic education and morality** is the increase of suicides among the youth. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "Here it is not the duty, the: 'Thou shalt,' is taught, but: 'Do what reason teaches you!' But what reason teaches them, some of these suicides have expressed in confessions such as the following: One says: 'Life is a fib; I leave it without regret, I die contented. Do not regret me; I am tired of life.' Another, 'I cannot sink down into the mud, and because man is a beast with lower instincts than any other animal, life is a hell; I wish to rest in the grave.' A third kills himself because life is 'stupid and banal'. A high school student writes: 'I wish to be buried civilly. I die an atheist, never believed in God, and don't want to believe in eternal life. After death, nothingness.' In general, there is a great weariness of life in all these confessions, which could easily be multiplied; the young generation grows up without ideal, without enthusiasm."

At its fourth meeting in Berlin, the Keplerbund declared: "The Keplerbund is an association for the propagation of pure knowledge of nature, unperturbed by efforts to stamp natural science with the stamp of a particular worldview. The interdenominational Kepler Association stands on the basis of the freedom of science and recognizes as its only tendency the investigation and service of truth. In the conviction that scientific knowledge can never remain in permanent contradiction with philosophical and religious views without crossing borders, it combines the demand for completely free research in the natural sciences with the further demand, which does not affect the method of research, to behave respectfully towards the results of research in other independent fields. It is not the task of the Kepler Association to prove the correctness of certain religious or philosophical doctrines. The Federation wants to see natural science protected from the abuse of anti-religious or materialistic propaganda in the name of natural science". If, however, the Keplerbund really wants to limit itself to the "propagation of pure knowledge of nature", then it must no longer, for example, speak out in favour of evolution. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. September 1910. No. 9.**

## On the history of infant baptism.

When our Lord Jesus Christ commanded his disciples to baptize all nations, Matth. 28, 19, his opinion was that they should baptize the people at the age at which they encountered them: the adults, if they desired baptism, the infants, if they were brought by those who had a right over them. ***Τά εάνη*** here means: "the kindreds, the peoples, nations," and not merely "the Gentiles" as distinguished from and excluding the Jews. This last meaning, as is well known, this word has in many places, e. g. Rom. 9, 24: ού ***μόνον έξ 'Ιουδαίων, άλλα και εξ εάνών.*** Thus under
The apostle Paul also separates the Gentile Christians from the Jewish Christians by this word, Gal. 2, 12. 13; Rom. 15, 27; 16, 4 and elsewhere. In the command to baptize Christ uses the word in the sense of "generations, nations." He did not want to exclude anyone from baptism, neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither old nor young. This is also clear from the account of St. Mark the Evangelist (16:15, 16): ***Καί είπεν αύτοΐς - πορευύλέντες εις τον κόσμον άπαντα κηρύξατε τό εύαγγέλιον πάοη τή κτίσει. Τ) πιστεύσας καί βαπτισύτίς σωϋήσεται, ό δέ άπιστήσας κατα κρι& ήοεται.*** His gospel, consequently also the baptism, is supposed to all creatures, ***πάση τή κτίσει,*** of course only to such creatures of God,
who can believe, that is, to men, but also to all men, whether infant or old, boy or girl, youth or virgin, male or female. Christ excludes no age, no rank from his baptismal grace. His command is quite general, extending to all, πάντα ***τά έϋνη, πάση τή κτίσει.*** (Cf. also
Gal. 3:26-28).

The sects now often want to limit this general command of Christ and exclude the little children from baptism. They feel justified in doing so, because Christ does not expressly name the children. But surely infants belong just as well to "all nations" and to "all creatures" as you and I or any other human being. If this kind of reasoning were correct, then one would also have to

We conclude that you and I are not saved, because our names are not written in the Bible. But we know that we are included in the word "world", Joh. 3, 16. Christ says Matth. 18, 11: "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost." We are lost, **ergo** Christ wants to make us blessed too. Infants belong to "all nations" and to "all creatures," **ergo** they too must be baptized. In the command to baptize, there is also no mention of women. Surely none of them would claim that women are not to be baptized either.

Chemnitz, in his "**Examen,**" says**: "Baptismus enim successit in locum circumcisionis, Col. 2, 11. Et idem est foedus pacis et pactum gratiae utrobique. Et quia illius foederis ratio, quoad infantes attinet, apostolis ex ratione circumcisionis iam nota erat, ideo Christus contentus fuit generali mandato de Baptismo: nec opus indicavit, de infantibus peculiariter aliquid praecipere. Nam nec femellarum peculiaris fit mentio, sed sententiae Matt. 28, 19; Marc. 16, 15 utuntur genere masculino: et tamen ex causa, ratione et fine institutionis recte indicatur, etiam feminas baptizandas.**" Luther: "Again, neither will they (the Anabaptists) bring a letter saying, Ye shall baptize old men, and not a child." (XVII, 2215, § 82.) The same: "If thou sayest, He hath not baptized called infants, neither hath he baptized called old men, nor men, nor women, nor any one in particular; but he hath baptized called all Gentiles, excluding none. Now the children also are a great portion of the Gentiles."

The **onus probandi is** certainly on the side of the sects. They must prove that the general command of Christ must be limited and exclude infants from baptism. This proof, however, they cannot bring. To be sure, they make certain assertions as proofs. For example, they say that "to teach" means. Since Christ commanded to teach all nations, it would be impossible to include little children, for they could not yet be taught. Now how does this relate? The intransitive meaning of **μαθητεύω** is "to be a pupil, ***uvi***, one," so Matth. 27, 57; transitive, τιν***ά, to*** make one a pupil, to instruct, to teach, Match. 28, 19; Apost. 14, 21 (Schirlitz). In this latter sense it is first used by Matthew, and then also by Luke. Accordingly, it got a new meaning in the biblical Greek.

***Μαθητεύειν*** comes from **μαθητής,** disciple. That therefore **μαθητεύω** in the
active sense - and so it is used in our place - can mean nothing else than "to make a disciple," is obvious and needs no proof. It has also been conceded by philologists: **Vincent, "Word Studies,**" to the passage, "**Teach *(μαθητεύσατε)*, Rev. rightly, make disciples of**." Cf. also Schirlitz, Dictionary; **Wall**, "**Defense of the History of Infant-Baptism.**"

(p. 489). Joh. 4, 1 stands **μαϋητάς *ποιεί και βαπτίζει***. Only these be interpretation also fluffs Matth. 28, 19. It is then immediately said how the apostles were to make disciples of the nations, namely: **βαπτίζοντες *αυτούς*,** by baptizing them, and: **διδάσκοντες *αυτούς*,** by teaching them. Bengel: **„*Μαθητεύειν* est discipulos facere. Complectitur baptismum et doctrinam hoc loco**." Christ, then, does not set teaching first, but baptizing. If any conclusion is to be drawn from this, it must be in favor of infant baptism. So also with this proof against infant baptism it is nothing.

But let us still ask: Can a child also be made a disciple of Christ? ***Μαθητής*** means disciple = Christian. Cf. Matth. 10, 42 with Mark 9, 41. apost. 11, 26: **χρηματίσαι *τε πρώτως εν Αντιοχείρ. τούς μα& ητάς Χριστιανούς*.** Elsewhere, for example, Pau describes lus the disciples as those who belong to Christ, 2 Cor. 10, 7; Gal. 5, 24; 3, 29; 1 Cor. 15, 23. But now Christ Himself says of the βρέφη, the very little children, whom the mothers carried out to Him, that the kingdom of God belongs to them, therefore that they also belong to Himself. **Ergo,** even the little children may be made μαΰηταί. They are not disciples by nature, for they are afflicted with original sin, and therefore children of wrath by nature. They are begotten of sinful seed and conceived and born in sins. They are born of the flesh and therefore cannot enter the kingdom of heaven unless they are born again by water and the Spirit. Because the doctrine of original sin has been abandoned, they are now also hostile to infant baptism, and not because it has no place in the command of Christ to baptize. Thus one false doctrine gives birth to another.

A very popular argument among the opponents of infant baptism is also the historical. They claim that in the first Christianity no children were baptized. The first Christians, especially the apostles, should have known what the opinion of Christ was. So I want to spread a little bit about it in the following. In doing so, it will become apparent how null and void even these "proofs" against infant baptism are. We will first look at the state of infant baptism at the time of the apostles and then during the following three centuries.

I. The state of infant baptism at the time of the apostles.

1. How did the apostles understand the command of Christ? Baptism was not something foreign to the apostles. John the Baptist had already baptized by the command of God, Luk. 3, 2. 3; 7, 30; Joh. 1, 31. 33; so they themselves had baptized by the command of Christ, Joh. 4, 2. Yes, baptism was nothing new to the Jews. They themselves had a doctrine of baptism, as appears from their Talmud. They held that the Jews were all baptized in their fathers at their passage through the Red Sea. They were therefore not to be baptized again. But because in

Scripture says, "As ye are, so shall your stranger be among you," so when the stranger, the Gentile, converted to Judaism, he was also baptized. And if his wives and children converted with him, they also were baptized. But all the children they begat after their conversion, after their own baptism, were not baptized, for they were already baptized in their fathers. It also happened that children were captured in war, or that the Gentiles abandoned their own children so that the Jews would take them in. Such were baptized.

Here is some evidence from Wall's "**History of Infant-Baptism**": "**Talmud - Maimonides, Issuri Bia, capp. 13. 14. And so in all ages when an ethnic is willing to enter into the covenant, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice; or if it be a woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice. As it is written,[4] As you are, so shall the stranger be? How are you? By circumcision and baptism and bringing of a sacrifice. So likewise the stranger (or proselyte) through all generations; by circumcision and baptism and bringing of a sacrifice. And what is the stranger's sacrifice ? A burnt offering of a beast, or two turtledoves or two young pigeons, both of them for a burnt offering." - "A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized, or baptized and not circumcised, he is not a proselyte till he be both circumcised and baptized: and he must be baptized in the presence of three**."

The proselyte had to be circumcised first. Only after the wound of circumcision was healed, not before, was baptism performed. Baptism was not to take place on the Sabbath or on Friday, nor even at night. The women were to be led to the water by women. Some Talmuds require two witnesses, others three.

As already mentioned, the Jews also baptized Gentile children after they were eight days old. The Jewish scribes also give the reason why children should be baptized for their own good and not wait until they can make up their own minds. They say it is certainly for the child's best. If it were doubtful whether it would be good or harmful for the child, one should let it stand. Then no one should decide the fate of the child. But here the benefit was certain. "**One may privilege a person, though he be incapable of knowing it, but one ought not to disprivilege a person without his knowledge.**" Up to what age the Gentiles could be baptized as infants was also fixed. A male child under thirteen years and a day, and a girl under twelve years and a day, were baptized as infants at the desire and consent of the father, or by order of the court; for folche feien not yet able to speak for themselves. But when they were older, they were treated as adults.

This practice of baptism had become common among the Jews at the time of Christ. There was also a widespread opinion among them that the Messiah would also baptize the Jewish people again. When John the Baptist appeared and baptized at the Jordan, it was nothing new to the Jews that he baptized. But it alienated them that he was also baptizing the Jews. The high council of the Jews sent a legation to him, not asking, "What doest thou?" but they asked, "Who art thou? " When therefore John declared that he was not the Messiah fei, they said, "Wherefore baptizest thou then?" Luk. 3, 15; Matth. 3, 11; Joh. 1, 25. It is also not at all impossible that John baptized little children. Since infant baptism was a common practice, why would the parents who were baptized by John not also bring their children to be baptized? The Jews knew that their children were also included in the covenant of God's people through circumcision, so why should their children be excluded from the grace of baptism? Of course, it is not expressly testified in Scripture that John baptized children. It is merely said: "Then went out unto him the city of Jerusalem, and all the country of Judaea, and all the countries of Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins", Matth. 3, 5. 6; Mark. 1, 5: "And were all baptized of him"; unless the last: "they confessed their sins," excludes the little children. But would not the same be reported if a great number of people of all ages were baptized, of whom the adults confessed their sins?

The apostle Paul refers to baptism in 1 Cor. 10, 1. 2. Israel was baptized through the cloud and through the sea under Moses. Does not the apostle here call the same a baptism which the Jews called a baptism? (NB. The apostle has not yet thereby professed the Jewish doctrine of baptism). Did not many children pass through the Red Sea? With great emphasis the apostle says that all, πάντες, enjoyed this advantage, young and old, children and aged. He emphasizes the "all" for the sake of application. But surely nothing false must be said, that a good application may be made of it! So because the apostle presents this passage through the Red Sea, the walking under the cloud, as the model of our baptism, he cannot exclude children from baptism, but must rather want to include them. Gerhard: "**Huc pertinet transitus Israelitarum per mare rubrum, quern typum baptismi fuisse docet apostolus 1 Cor. 10, 2; *jam vero* in illo comitatu fuerunt complures infantes, Ex. 12, 37. Ergo ut typo respondeat antitypon, infantes etiam erunt baptizandi**."- Weimar Bible: "This passage through the Red Sea, and this covering by the cloud, has been an image of holy baptism, so instituted in the New Testament."

Col. 2, 11. 12 Paul calls the baptism a circumcision. The circumcision of the Old Testament is gone. Baptism has taken its place. Baptism is now the circumcision in the New Testament. The Jews were strictly commanded to circumcise their children on the eighth day. Now baptism has taken the place of circumcision. Wouldn't it be strange if the children were not baptized? Paul certainly includes the children when he calls baptism a circumcision. Otherwise it would have been necessary, in the very use of this image, to declare that the children of the New Testament could not receive circumcision as the children of the Old Testament did. Therefore our dogmatists rightly infer infant baptism from this image. Gerhard: "Ex circumcisionis typo. Gen. 17, 12 jubet Deus, ut puelli Israelitici octavo statim a nativitate die circumcidantur; jam vero baptismus in Novo Testamento successit in locum circumcisionis, Col. 2, 11; ergo ut infantes Veteris Testamenti per circumcisionem in foedus Dei sunt recepti, ita quoque infantes Novi Testamenti per baptismum foederi divino erunt inserendi." (See also the quotation from Chemnitz in the Introduction.) We say with Chemnitz' "Examen": "Neque enim in Novo Testamento angustior, parcior et malignior est gratia Dei, quam in Veteri fuit, ubi circumcisio etiam ad infantes pertinebat." To the Ephesians Paul writes that Christ has cleansed "the congregation," namely, the Church, by the bath of water in the Word, Eph. 5:26. But the Church has at all times included little children. - From the above mentioned sayings of Paul it is clear that he understood the baptism command of Christ in such a way that it also includes the children.

According to the opinion of many, 1 Cor. 7, 14 also belongs to Paul's sayings about infant baptism. So Augustin, Pelagius, Origen, Jerome, Joh. Gerhard, Wall, Guericke, etc. Tertullian says, the children are designati sanctitati; so also the Weimar Bible. According to Wall, this is supposed to be the Apostle's opinion: "For it has ordinarily come to pass, that an unbelieving husband was brought to the faith, and so to baptism, by his wife: and likewise an unbelieving wife by her husband. If it were not so, and if the wickedness or infidelity of the unbelieving party did usually prevail, the children of such would be generally kept unbaptized, and so be unclean. But now we see, by the grace of God, a contrary effect, for they are generally baptized, and so become holy, or sanctified." Luther writes in his letter to Melanchthon of January 13, 1522: "I would also like to know how you take the word 1 Cor. 7, 14: 'Otherwise your children would be unclean; but now they are holy,' whether you wish this to be understood of adults alone, or of the holiness of the flesh? For I would have it proved that little children were baptized according to the apostolic custom, and in the time of the apostles.

Though I see what may be said of this sanctification, yet would I also hear thy judgment concerning it. For why should he speak of the children alone, since all things are holy to the saints, and all things are pure to the pure?" (St. L. XV, 2605.) The following year, August, 1523, Luther wrote a lengthy exposition of the seventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. In it he says of infants, v. 14: "So infants are also holy, though they are not baptized nor Christians. They are not holy in their own persons; of which holiness St. Paul does not here speak, but they are holy unto thee, that thy holiness may deal with them, and bring them up, that thou be not profaned in them, even as though they were a holy thing." (St. L. VIII, 1061.) So also Melanchthon interpreted this passage. This is also undoubtedly the meaning of this passage. That the ancients used the word αγιάζω**, sanctificare**, of baptism, is not yet proof that the Apostle used it in this sense in this passage. ***Ἡγίαοται*** **(perf. pass.)** is "been sanctified." It does not mean, that has already been done, that believing spouses have converted their unbelieving spouses. Thus Wall. V. 16 the apostle first holds out to them the possibility of such a thing happening. Here in v. 14 he assures them their marriage is not unholy or unclean because one part is unbelieving. The unbelieving part is sanctified by the believing part, 1 Tim. 4, 5. Their marriage is a Christian one. So they could confidently continue to use their unchristian spouse. If it were not so, their children would be unclean, but now they are holy. Nor does he say that the children are sanctified, but they are holy, νυν ***δέ αγιά έστιν.*** Nor can there be any question here of inward holiness; "for parents do not beget, inasmuch as they are holy by grace, but inasmuch as they are naturally men, John 3:6." False, accordingly, is the doctrine of the Reformed, Presbyterians, Mennonites, Hoffmannians, etc.: "The children born of Christian parents are holy and God's children even without baptism and before the same." (Guenther, Symbolism, p. 322.) The children have the same holiness as the unbelieving spouse. There can therefore be no question of inward spiritual holiness; for no unbeliever, whether man, woman, or child, is holy in this sense. (Cf. also Bengel, **Gnomon**, on the passage; D. Stöckhardt in the Synodal Report of the Iowa District of 1889, p. 66 ff.) A textual explanation thus takes this saying from us as a point of proof for infant baptism - this, however, does not embarrass us at all, for we have other points of proof - but it also takes the ground from under the feet of those who, on the basis of this saying, declare infant baptism to be superfluous.

The apostle Peter understood the command of Christ just like Paul. This can be seen in Apost. 2, 38. 39: "Peter said to them: Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus.

Christ for the remission of sins, ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you and to your children is this promise." What promise also belongs to the children? The promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit. How were they to become partakers of this promise? Through baptism. The fact that the apostle says, "Repent," does not prove that he means only grown-up children. Of the adults, however, no one was allowed to be baptized who was not also outwardly repentant. Little children who cannot yet give any sign of their repentance are to be baptized in this way. They cannot show their impenitence either. So Peter also refers the command of Christ to baptize children.

2. Did the apostles baptize children? Certainly they did, though we are not told in explicit words in Scripture. Among the three thousand souls baptized at the first Christian Pentecost in Jerusalem, there may have been many children. At that time, no doubt, whole families also became believers. Shouldn't parents have their children baptized? They were accustomed to their children being received into the Old Testament covenant by circumcision. Their little children had partaken of Old Testament grace. Should they not now be received into the New Testament covenant? Would it not have alienated them if there should be no special means of grace for children in the New Testament? Should not the apostles then all the more have shown them why the children of the New Testament had no need of such a means? But now they do not say a word about this. On the contrary, they show that baptism belongs to the children of the New Testament, 1 Cor. 10, 2; Col. 2, 11. 12; Apost. 2, 38. 39.

Apost. 10 we are told how Cornelius called his relatives and friends together to hear the apostle Peter. All of them were baptized by Peter's command. If they had small children, they also brought them with them. If they were there, they were also baptized.

The apostle Paul baptized Lydia and her household, the jailer and all his own, Apost. 16, of Stephana's household, 1 Cor. 1, 16. A family also includes children. I suppose in these families little children were also baptized by the apostle. Do you assert the contrary? Dear, prove that their children were already grown up!

If the apostles really baptized little children, why does St. Luke not mention this explicitly? To this objection Wall replies, "**History of Infant-Baptism" (I, p. 648 f.): "Whoever observes the tenor of that history, and considers the state of those times, will perceive that St. Luke's aim is to give a summary account of the main and principal passages of their lives, and of those passages especially in which they found the**

**greatest opposition. And in such a history, (which is but short in all,) who can look for an account of what children they baptized? Suppose that the life and actions of some renowned and laborious modern bishop or doctor were to be written, (say of Bishop Usher, Stillingfleet, etc.) and that, in a volume ten times as long as the book of the Acts of the Apostles: who will expect to find there any account of what children they christened? And yet there is no doubt but they did christen hundreds, or (if we take in what was done by ministers deputed by them) thousands. The main business of an apostle was to preach, convert, attest the truth of Christ's resurrection, miracles, etc., and not to baptize, as St. Paul says, 2 Cor. 1, 17. The baptizing of such as the apostles had convinced, and especially of their children, would of course be left to deputies. Yet of the six baptisms, (which are all that St. Paul is mentioned to have been concerned in,) three were the baptisms of whole households (Acts 16, 15. 35; 1 Cor. 1, 16: such an one *and all his)*. And that is as much as can reasonably be expected of so minute a circumstance**."

3. How did the apostles baptize? When we ask how they baptized, we first think of what they baptized with, the element that the apostles used. It should be noted that they baptized only with water. Christ had commanded them to baptize all nations, **βαπτίζειν.** Christ had further named no element wherewith to baptize. But the word **βαπτίζειν** in its historical meaning, and where no other element is expressly named, always means to baptize with water. But St. Paul also expressly describes baptism as a "bath of water in the word," Eph. 5:26: ινα ***αυτήν άγιάση κα& αρίσας τω λουτρερ τοϋ ΰδατος έν ρήματι.*** The Apostle Peter says in the well-known passage, 1 Pet. 3, 20 f.: "in which few, that is, eight souls, were kept through water, which now also makes us blessed in baptism" (***ό"' ΰδατος, ο και ημάς άντίτυπον νυν σώζει βάπτισμα***). Thus also Christ had said to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," Joh. 3, 5. Known further are the examples of John the Baptist baptizing in the Jordan, Mark. 1, 5; Matt. 3, 6; with water, Matt. 3, 11; Luk. 3, 16; "at Enon, near Salim, for there was much water there," ***ΰδατα πολλά,*** many springs, Joh. 3, 23. Christ was baptized by John in the Jordan, Matt. 3. The eunuch from Mohrenland saith to Philip, "Behold, there is water; what hindereth me to be baptized?" Apost. 8, 36. 38. 39. Peter saith in the house of Cornelius, "May any man also refuse water, that these should not be baptized?" Apost. 10, 47. 48, etc.

The application of water in baptism happened in connection with the word. Paul explicitly calls the baptism "the water bath in the word", Eph. 5, 26. According to Christ's command the baptism had to be done in connection with the word.

were done in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Matth. 28, 19. "As to another **βαπτίζειν** the **mandatum divinum does** not refer, so to another also the **promissio divina** cannot properly be referred." (Höfling.) Wherefore the Apostles also without doubt baptized according to Christ's command to baptize. This is not contradicted by Apost. 2, 38: "Peter said unto them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of JEsu Christ for the remission of sins," ***έπι τφ όνόματι Ίησον Χρίστον, nor*** Apost. 8, 16: "but were baptized in the name of Christ JEsu alone," εις ***τό όνομα τον κνρίον Ίησον,*** nor Apost. 10, 48: "and commanded them TO be baptized in the name of the LORD," ***έν τφ όνόματι Ίησον Χρίστον,*** nor Apost. 19, 5: "Hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord JEsu," τό ***όνομα τον κνρίον Ίησον.*** Here it is not intended to denote the form of baptism. Rather, the benefit of baptism is here referred to. They are thereby brought into relationship with JEsu. They are joined to JEsu by baptism, obtain a share in the goods of grace and salvation which he has purchased. This is especially indicated by the preposition εις. In his Pentecostal sermon Peter uses *έπ*ί, on the name. This implies faith and confession. JEsus Christ, the content of faith and confession, is also the ground on which being baptized rests. To whom Cornelius and they that were with him Peter commands to baptize ***έν τφ όνόματι,*** in the name of JEsu Christ. Here is designated the realm wherein alone true baptism takes place. The "name" here is not the mere designation, but "God Himself, Christ Himself, as He has revealed Himself to us."

Did the apostles rebaptize? Bengel claims that those who were baptized by John the Baptist were baptized again. (**Gnomon** on Acts 19:5.) But he admits that the apostles and Apollos were not rebaptized. The twelve disciples who were baptized by Paul had not received baptism from John himself, but from some of John's disciples who had not followed Christ and had not believed in him. John's baptism was from God, the baptism of these disciples was not. (Cf. Stöckhardt, Bibl. Gesch. d. N. T., to Apost. 19, 1-20.) Hy. Müller.

(Conclusion follows.)

---

## The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church.

(Continued.)

Probably no article of our Christian faith is so suitable in its fine nature to reveal the counsel of the heart as the article of the election by grace. This article is the final touchstone by which it can be seen whether someone has accepted the Lutheran shibboleth: "By grace alone.

according to its full content and scope, makes it the emblem of his faith, doctrine, and confession. For this "By grace alone" is the very "rock of vexation" to man's natural reason. And since the doctrine of election in Scripture most clearly and forcibly advocates this "by grace alone" (**F. C.** XI, 43), and defends the free and undeserved grace of God against every antithesis, this very article has from time immemorial been a peculiar stumbling block to human reason. It is in this article, after all, that it becomes evident whether a man wants to take his reason captive to the obedience of faith or not. Whereas in other articles of faith it is not always impossible to make such ambiguous speeches that one cannot get behind a man's heart opinion, this article cuts off this possibility. Yes and no are so defined in this Article, and are opposed to each other with such precision of definition, that no room is left for an ambiguous position. This article puts the demand of the first commandment in the brightest light. Here it is shown whether a man really fears, loves, and trusts God above all things. It is here, therefore, that the basic direction of a church is most clearly shown.

Of this the history of the doctrinal controversy concerning the election of grace within the Synodal Conference furnishes striking proof. In this case, too, the different positions taken by the contending parties have revealed the counsel of the heart. It has become evident who, on the one hand, are those who will not "depart from the article of the justification of a sinner before God by grace alone, nor yield, let heaven and earth fall, or what will not remain" (Müller, Sym. B., p. 300), and who, on the other hand, are those who, though they had hitherto marched along with us under this banner, yet did not believe in their hearts what their mouths confessed. In this sense Walther writes: "As deplorable and heartbreaking as the present controversy over the doctrine of the election of grace is on the one hand, it is nevertheless a delicious controversy on the other. Even our orthodox American Lutheran Church, as we now see with horror, carried synergism within her like a secret sore that threatened to poison her blood and rob her of the life of faith. This ulcer is now, thank God, cut out." (L. u. W. 27, 417.)

Let us now first of all consider, in as brief a form as possible, the Scriptural doctrine of the election of grace, bringing it at the same time into the proper connection with the other articles of Christian doctrine.

God wants all men to be helped, all sinners to be saved. He therefore determined from eternity to redeem all men after their fall, which he foreknew according to his omniscience; and this counsel Christ executed in time. He

died for the ungodly; his blood is the propitiation for the sins of the world. And just as Christ, according to the eternal counsel of the Father, has purchased salvation for all men, so God also earnestly desires that all men take hold of the salvation purchased through Christ in faith, make it their own, and thus become blessed. For this reason the Holy Spirit offers salvation to all men in the gospel, calling them earnestly and powerfully through his word. But because all men are by nature dead in trespasses and sins, man cannot by his own powers prepare himself for grace, cannot bring himself to faith. Conversion, the gift of faith, is God's work alone. We are raised by the faith God has wrought in us. And as the gift of faith, so perseverance in it to the end is a work of God's grace alone. In short, our blessedness, and all that pertains to the attainment of it, we owe entirely to the unmerited grace of God, and to the dear merit of our Saviour. "Yes, we know from God's Word that God has so earnestly taken care of our calling, our conversion, our blessedness, that He has already in eternity consulted and decided upon our calling, conversion, and blessedness, and upon each one of them, and even upon mine. And this eternal counsel and decision of God concerning our calling, conversion, justification, preservation, blessedness, in virtue of which we are now in time called, converted, justified, in virtue of which we have come to faith, and are preserved in faith, and shall obtain the end of faith, we call the counsel of predestination, or the election of grace." (L. u. W. 27, 365.) This counsel of God "passeth not (therefore) over the pious and wicked in particular, but over the children of God alone, who are chosen and ordained unto eternal life." (**F. C.** XI, 5.) But as to those who are not saved, we teach, according to God's word, that the only cause of their damnation is in themselves. Their persistent unbelief alone is to blame for their not being saved. He has not arbitrarily passed by them with his grace, but they have wilfully and persistently rejected the salvation that was also intended for them, and are therefore condemned because of their unbelief.

This is in condensed brevity what we are taught in God's Word of the election of grace. And so far the mystery of the election of grace is a revealed mystery.

But just as we come to a point in the consideration of every article of faith about which God's Word gives us no information, so also in the consideration of the doctrine of the election of grace. Here, too, we finally stand at an abyss over which God has not built us a bridge in His Word, and our reason cannot build one. This abyss, this mystery in the strictest sense, is the so-called **discretio personarum**. There rises the

Question: Why is it that some are chosen and others not, since all men are in the same condemnation? This question we cannot and ought not to answer. The **cur alii prae aliis**? is one of the things which God's wisdom has hidden from us. (Cf. Rom. 9.) God's Word clearly and definitely reveals to us only the double: "Israel, thou bringest thyself to misery; for thy salvation standeth with me alone," Hos. 13:9; or, in other words, the sole cause of the election of some is God's free grace in Christ; the sole cause of the damnation of others is their wanton and persevering opposition. With this knowledge the Lutheran Church is content. In right humility of faith, according to the spirit which is her fundamental direction, she cries out in her confession to all the world: "But what in this disputation wants to run too high and out of bounds, there we are to put our finger on our mouth with Paulo, to remember and say, Who art thou, man, that wilt be right with God?" In this, of course, it finds no grace before the judgment seat of reason, and therefore not with all those who make reason the formal principle of their faith. Reason has the need to arrange everything logically and, according to its sinful nature, to do so even where two truths revealed in God's Word cannot be rationally communicated.

Now what is the position of the genuine (Calvin) Reformed Church in this doctrinal play? How is its "other spirit" revealed here?

This church has not only established a doctrine of election by grace, of which Calvin himself says: "I confess that it is a terrible counsel," but at the same time makes its doctrine of election by grace the material principle of its whole system of doctrine. She herself draws from her false doctrine of election with iron consistency all the conclusions which can be drawn from it to other articles of doctrine, quite unconcerned about the fact that in every conclusion she is compelled to strike sunny sayings of Scripture in the face. About this a quotation from the "Ev. Kirchenzeitung" (cited in L. u. W. 14, 125) reads: "If Calvin in his doctrine of justification uses in part the words of Luther, and if, conversely, Luther in his doctrine of predestination (namely, in his book: **De servo arbitrio**) uses in part the words of Calvin, then in this connection it is simply necessary to recall the old saying: **Duo si dicunt idem, non est idem**. In our case the situation is such that Calvin subordinates his doctrine of justification to his doctrine of predestination, while conversely Luther subordinates his doctrine of predestination to his doctrine of justification. But this also signals the dogmatic opposition between the two Reformers as one of principle, and makes union impossible as long as this opposition exists." According to Calvin, only the elect are truly justified, while temporal believers have only been justified in appearance. God is not serious about His absolution. This is essentially-

This is very different from the justification of the elect. For the non-elect there is no merit on the basis of which they can be justified. In the confession of the Synod of Dordrecht it is said: "The Synod rejects the error of those who teach that the faith of those who believe for a time is not different from the justifying and saving faith, but only in regard to the duration. (Guenther, Symb, § 39.) - On the fact that the Calvinistic Reformers develop all their articles of faith from their doctrine of election, or yet standardize them according to it, Quenstedt writes: "The Calvinists make the nearest and inner foundation of their faith the absolute predestination of certain men to eternal life, from which predestination they derive almost all the other articles which belong to the restoration of man, viz. the decree of the mission of the Son, of the passion, death, and merit of Christ, of the satisfaction, how far it extends, of the profession of the blessed, of the presentation and application of the means necessary to salvation and conversion, of the efficacy of these means, namely, the word and sacraments, . . hence the absolute decree is justly called the head, source, and origin of the rest of the Calvinical errors." (Angef. in L. u. W. 27, 459.) Calvin himself says: "This is what I said at first, that at last one must always go back to the mere arbitrariness of the divine will." Hülsemann in fine writing "**Calvinismus irreconciliabilis" fpreibt: "Doctrina Calvinistarum de his et cognatis articulis unice dependet a doctrina de praedestinatione, modificatur, formatur et limitatur ad hypothesin de praedestinatione,**" which he then elaborates on many sheets, (**p. mea** 24.) That our Lutheran theologians do not say too much when they assert that the Calvinists made their false doctrine of election the material principle of their whole system of doctrine, is shown us by Beza's remarks at the colloquy at Mömpelgard. He presents the Reformed doctrinal concept in approximately the following way: God, as the wisest Master Builder, had a purpose in view in the creation of the world and especially of man. This purpose, which is eternal and unchangeable, and which precedes order according to all causes, was this: he willed to create men for his glory. But the glory of God is not known nor praised unless it is revealed through mercy and justice. Therefore God made an eternal and unchangeable decree, according to which he appointed a number of men to eternal life out of pure mercy, but some to eternal damnation out of righteous judgment, that he might manifest his mercy in those, but his justice in these. Since God had set this purpose before Himself at creation, He now had to consider ways and means so that He might accomplish that purpose, so that His mercy and justice might be made manifest. Now, since the merciful

And since mercy cannot be revealed where there is no misery, man had to be created in such a way that God's mercy could work in him. And since righteousness cannot be revealed without guilt, man also had to be created in such a way that God could show his righteousness in him. And so God made an immutable decree, preceding all secondary causes, to choose some men according to his infinite mercy, and to make them blessed in Christ, but to reject others according to his justice, and to condemn them because of their own guilt. But because God is good, he could not create man evil; he therefore created him in such a way that, if he left him to himself, he would have to fall. Therefore Eve had to be seduced by the devil in order that she might fall into sin with her husband. Man therefore did not fall without the will of God, nor in such a way that God was a mere spectator. For if he has ordained the end, it necessarily follows that he must also have ordained the cause which led to it. Therefore man did not fall into sin by chance; but if not by chance, he must have fallen into sin by virtue of God's providence, because that must necessarily follow which God had decreed, seeking in man's fall a way and a cause that he might manifest his glory by manifesting his mercy and justice. Thus, in order that God might accomplish the purpose of creating man, Adam and Eve had to be deceived by the devil. But because God could not reveal his mercy to the elect before his justice was satisfied for their sin, he sent his Son into the world; who by suffering and dying satisfied for the sins of the elect. And God also powerfully calls these elect; he makes them righteous, he sanctifies them, he also makes them eternally blessed. The rest of mankind are destined to damnation, and in them God reveals his righteousness by condemning them eternally." (L. u. W. 27, 460.) Literally, Beza, in **Resp. ad acta Mompelg.** thus writes: "I say that no time has been, nor will be, when God would have had mercy on all and sundry, would have had mercy on them, or will have mercy on them." (II, 194.) With these utterances of Beza the Reformed confessional writings quite agree. In the **Formula cons. helv.** it is said: "And indeed God willed to reveal his glory in this way, that he resolved first to create man perfect, then to allow his fall, and only to have mercy on some of the fallen, and therefore to choose them, but to leave the others in the corrupt mass, and finally to consecrate them to eternal destruction." In the Dordrecht Resolutions it is said, "The Synod rejects the errors of those who teach that God, of his mere righteous will, admits no one to the fall of Adam, and to the general state of sin and damnation.

or decided to pass over in the communication of the grace necessary for faith and conversion." In the **Consensus Genev**. it is said, "If we are not ashamed of the Gospel, we must confess what is plainly taught therein, that God, according to his eternal good pleasure, the causes of which depend on nothing else, has ordained some at his pleasure to blessedness, while others are rejected." (Guenther, Symb., § 36. 41. 38.)

By this Reformed doctrine of election by grace, God is made the author of sin. In their confessions, it is true, they reject the doctrine that God is the author of sin; but this doctrine not only follows from their doctrine of election, but the Reformed theologians utter it quite blatantly in their private writings. Calvin writes: "God caused man, who was in his own image, and who had not yet had to do with any sin, to be tempted by Satan; yea, he lent (to Satan) even the beast (the serpent) for this purpose, which otherwise had never been obedient to him. What was this but to give the enemy arms and weapons for man's destruction? . . . But when I speak of the permission of God, this is my opinion, that he determined in himself what he would have done." (Masius, p. 24.) In the same pronounced manner, the generality of God's grace and the generality of salvation are denied by the Reformed doctrine of election by grace, as the quotations cited sufficiently show. Thus all certainty of faith, even faith itself, is lost, for the essence of faith consists in a certain confidence, Heb. 11:1. By the doctrine of unavoidable grace, which is connected with the Reformed doctrine of election by grace, both law and gospel are abolished. The sure sinner is strengthened in his sin, and there is no gospel comfort for the terrified sinner. Cromwell comforted himself on his dying bed by saying that he had once stood in the faith. Finally, by the Reformed doctrine of election by grace, to mention only this particularly, God is made a hypocrite, calling many men only for a pretence, giving them faith, and justifying them. Even the Reformed church historian Hagenbach judges of this doctrine: "Unfortunately, however, it now happened that, as the love feast of the Lord was turned into an eric apple under the hands of Lutheran zealots, so also the doctrine of election was hardened under the hands of the Reformed contenders into a rugged fatalism, which was wholly calculated to alarm anxious minds and to strengthen crude spirits in their defiant certainty. No wonder if the Lutherans thought to find in this the teaching of the Koran, and imagined the God of the Calvinists to be a heartless tyrant." (Hagenb., Kircheng. 4, 337.) Aptly does Guerike characterize the "other spirit" of the Reformed Church as it confronts us in her doctrine of the election of grace,

with the words: "Zwingli's system is philosophical, a pagan, dualistic pantheism: God the soul of the world, matter the body; and inasmuch then as God is the **principale agens,** but matter the suffering, all being is also God's being, and there is nothing apart from God. ('**Certum est**,' writes Zwingli, '**quod quantum ad esse et existere attinet, nihil sit, quod non numen sit; id. enim est rerum universarum esse**.') From this philosophical principle, to which then in particular also the Fall of Man must appear as one given with necessity and wrought by God, now necessarily flowed Zwingli's predestinatianism, which he confesses in the harshest terms ('**inquies, coactus est ad peccandum; permitto, inquam, coactum esse**'), whereby it should be noted, of course, that according to Zwingli, **in** accordance with what has already been indicated, evil, as flowing from the **voluntas Dei, is** not to be evil before God. Thus, according to him, David's adultery, as far as its author God is concerned, is no more sinful in the sight of God than if a bull were to jump on a whole herd and make it pregnant. . . . And thus the Reformed doctrinal concept has been developed in all its rigidity preparatory, inconsistent, and merely philosophical by Zwingli, consistent, absolute, and theological by Calvin, and accordingly pronounced in one part of the Reformed symbols, while another part pursues a mediating, admittedly mostly only negative, aposiopetical tendency . . . . Thus, while the Lutheran Church bases its faith in election on the Word, the Reformed Church bases it on feeling, according to the above, in the adherence to a secret counsel of God. This, too, is a difference which constitutes a significant difference between the two churches, not only on this point, but in general, and which is also clearly evident in the Christian revival of more recent times, which has proceeded from the Reformed Church." (Guericke, Symb., 399 ff.)

The spirit of the Reformed Church as such is therefore a spirit of wild speculation of reason, which cares not how God has revealed Himself to us, but wants to reveal Himself; and Reformed piety as such is vain sentimentalism. The Reformed Church as such, in her doctrine of faith, as in her life of faith, has forsaken the Word. As she speaks of God and divine things apart from and without the Word, so also apart from and without the Word she wants to obtain the grace of God and to become certain of it in her heart.

That this is a different spirit than the Lutheran one is obvious.

The Christian religion is a religion of facts. It is not based on philosophical deductions and speculations, not on innate religiosity or on man's natural concepts of right and wrong, etc., but on the great deeds of God which have taken place for the redemption of the human race.

are. But at the center of all that God has done for the redemption of the world is Christ. He is the one, great "fact" that includes everything else. All of God's acts of salvation have him as their content. In him and through him and for his sake they all happened. All Scripture, both Old and New Testament, bears witness to him. He is not only a teacher, but at the same time the actual content of his teaching. One cannot accept his teaching at all without accepting him himself as God and the only Savior of the world. "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins!" he cries to the Jews, John 8:24. He calls himself the Way, the Door, the Truth, the Life, the Bread 2c.; he says, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me"; he does not say, by my doctrine, but, by me. Gar gloriously Walther says in a sermon, "Christ is the centre of all the writings of the apostles and prophets, the foundation of the church, the jewel of our hope, the fountain of salvation and grace; after him we are called Christians, from him all that is necessary to our salvation flows." Likewise Luther: "We Christians have the sense and understanding of the Bible, because we have the New Testament, that is, JEsum Christ, who was promised in the Old Testament, and afterwards came, and brought with him the light and understanding of the Scriptures, as he saith Joh. 5:46, Moses wrote of me. If ye believed Moses, would ye believe me also? Item, Luk. 24: 'It must be fulfilled, what is written of me in the law, prophets and psalms? For there it is, there it is, there it remains. Whoever does not have nor want this man, who is called Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom we Christians preach, right and pure, let him leave the Biblia alone, I advise him; he will certainly be offended, and the more he studies, the more blind and foolish he becomes, whether he be a Jew, a Tartar, a Turk, a Christian, or whatever else he wants to boast about." And in another place he writes: "He who stands on this, that Jesus Christ is true God and man, died for us and rose again, to him all other articles fall firmly and stand with him. . . Again, I have perceived that all error, heresy, idolatry, vexation, abuse, and wickedness in the church have come originally from this article or part of the faith of JESUS CHRIST being despised or lost." (Erl. 23, 258.)

Now what is the doctrinal position of the Reformed Church in this article? Guericke (Symbolik, p. 290) first gives it a good report card when he writes: "Almost all Christian church parties recognize in the Redeemer, so that he could accomplish redemption, in Christo, the one person, the one 'I,' Christ's divine and human nature, . . . the Evangelical (Lutheran) and Reformed Church in the most definite way at all"; but he also soon adds: "Only then has (but) the doctrine of the two natures in Christo

their great, their infinitely practical significance, if at the same time such an intimate connection between the two is assumed and believed that by no means can the one be thought separate from the other **in concreto**, never Christ's divinity without his humanity, never his humanity without his divinity.... so that the **communio naturarum**, if it be not merely verbal, but real, if it be essentially effective, must necessarily be a mutual communication of properties . . . includes, whereas the Reformed Church actually annuls and nullifies that which it literally states of the communion of natures to personal unity, by frowning upon the evangelical doctrine of **communicatio idiomatum** and ubiquity in decided, though refined, Nestorianism." When Guericke complains that the Reformed Church, "what it literally states of the communion of natures to personal unity," actually abrogates again, he thus passes a judgment which correctly characterizes the Reformed spirit. Melanchthon already complains bitterly of the ambiguity of the Reformed in their speech, and the Formula of Concord reproaches them for "using words in the closest approximation to the Augsburg Confession and to the form or manner of speaking of these churches" (C. F. VII, 2), while they connected with these words an entirely different meaning. Hence it is that the history of the church contains a long and sad chapter on cryptocalvinists. Of crypto-Lutherans, on the other hand, it knows nothing and will never know anything.

Let us now seek to be clear as to the manner in which the Reformed Church actually abolishes again what it states in right words concerning the person of Christ. "Our church teaches that the union of the Godhead and humanity in Christ is a personal one, so that now the Godhead and humanity in Christ are but one person." (Ber. d. Mich.-Distr. 1886, Thesis II.) But the very essence of the personal union is the communication of natures, that "most sensible mutual interpenetration and ineffable communion of natures themselves, for the sake of which God is truly and really uttered by man, and man by God." (Dietr. Cat., fr. 220.) Without such the most sensuous mutual interpenetration of natures in Christ, personal union would consist in a mere communion of names. It follows, then, that by every statement by which the communion of natures is annulled, personal union is also annulled.

The Reformed Church denies in the strongest terms this most sensible interpenetration of natures in Christ. According to the Reformed view, the two natures in Christ are and remain separated from one another by a great gulf. Personal union, according to Reformed doctrine, does not consist in intimate communion, but only in loose contact and external-

relationship of natures. According to their dualistic principle, the heavenly and the earthly, the divine and the human, the spiritual and the material can be in loose contact, in mystical connection and in effective relationship, but they can never be intimately and inseparably united. "**Finitum non est capax infiniti. - Propria non possunt alteri subjecto, tametsi unito, realiter communicari. - Nulla natura in se recipit contradictoria**." These Reformed axioms cut off from the outset the possibility of a personal, supremely sensible union of the divine and human natures in Christ. A Christ such as the Lutheran Church confesses on the basis of Scripture does not fit into the dualistic doctrinal system of the Reformed Church. In the Christ, as he alone fits into this system, there can only be a union such as exists between the branches of a tree and its roots, the city of Antwerp and the sea, examples of which the Reformed themselves make use. But this necessarily abolishes personal union altogether. Personal union in the Reformed sense is only a standing by, a being supported and carried by human nature in the person of the Logos. Clearly, briefly, and firmly, Beza said at the Mömpelgard Colloquium, "The Godhead has not been communicated to humanity."

That according to Reformed doctrine there is only a very loose contact between the two natures in Christ is also shown by Zwingli's notorious allosis. He himself declares that this is "a leap, or a jumping off, or a transition, or, if you prefer, an interchange, by virtue of which, when we speak of the one nature in Him, we make use of words which denote the other nature." So when 1 John 1:7 says, "The blood of JEsu Christ His Son maketh us clean from all sin," the Holy Ghost means pure human blood, but calls it God's blood by virtue of a "leap." When it is said, "The Prince of life ye have slain, the Lord of glory ye have crucified," we must not, on this account, break out into the poignant lamentation, "O great distress! God Himself is dead, on the cross He died"; the Holy Spirit only meant to tell us by those words that a mere man died, but calls this man by virtue of a "leap" Prince of life and Lord of glory. We therefore do the Reformed no injustice at all if we do not trust their often correct, even glorious speeches about Christ, if we nevertheless reproach them with overthrowing the real foundation of our faith, Christ. "If their doctrine is consistently carried out," says the Synodal Report of the Michigan District of 1888, "the whole of Christianity is destroyed, for there the heart of Christianity, the foundation and cornerstone, is taken out."

The Reformed doctrine of the person of Christ is, as Guericke says,

a "refined Nestorianism." To obscure this somewhat, the Reformed make a distinction between divine personality and divine nature. The personal union is said to be only a union between the divine personality and the human nature, not a communion of both natures in Christo fine. In this they follow the Adoptians of the 8th century, whose founder Felix, Bishop of Urgel in Catalonia, when asked whether Christ should be called a natural or only an assumed Son of God according to His human nature, replied that He should be called "an assumed Son of God according to His human nature." Thus also, according to Reformed doctrine, the human nature in Christ was only adopted by the divine personality; not are divine and human natures really and truly united in him into one person. Human nature is indeed given divine personality, but not divine essence. It is obvious that this is a nonsensical evasion, for personality is not a being apart from another being, but only a mode, a mode of existence that has a being. Personality can never be thought of without a being. To say that human nature in Christ has been given a divine personality, but not a divine essence, is simply to say that human nature in Christ has not been given anything.

Let us now follow some sayings from Reformed writings: Neustadt Admonition: "When something human is said of the God (Christ), and something divine of the man (Christ), it is only, as to natures, a manner of speaking." - Danaeus: "In the personal union only the human nature is joined to the person which was before and existed for itself." - Peter Martyr: "It is enough that the immeasurable and infinite Godhead sustains and supports humanity wherever it is." - Wendelinus: "It cannot be concluded at all from the taking up of human nature into the person of the Word (or Son of God) to the communion of the person. It is enough that the nature assumed should be personally borne or sustained." (From this saying again one sees so quite clearly the playing of the Reformed with words in holy things. For what is it supposed to mean, that the assumed nature is "personally borne or preserved"? The only possible sense is, The Deity or the Divine Person bears and sustains the assumed human nature. But then one asks, "Is there any nature or creature at all that is not borne or sustained by the Godhead in Christ?" You see, the addition of "personal" to "borne or sustained" is blue smoke; in truth, according to Reformed doctrine, the assumed human nature in Christo has

no more of the Godhead than any other nature and creature.) - Anhaltine **Repetitio**: "So then the whole doctrine, so called **communicatio idiomatum,** is such a way of speaking," etc. Further, "We prove from God's Word that there was not an essential, natural, actual, or real outpouring of the attributes, and that neither the attributes nor the effects, which are said of the person half of one nature, are to be drawn to both natures in Christ." Here it is to be noted what Guericke writes in his Symbolism (p. 308): "Most Reformed symbols, in rejecting the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ, employ the artifice of purposely drawing it in the same coarse, clumsy, carnal manner, against which the evangelical doctrinal concept itself has often objected, in order that it may then be the more easily refuted. But what was meant was precisely only the essential evangelical doctrine itself, because only it was historically opposed to the Reformed doctrinal concept." When, therefore, the Reformed say, "We prove from God's Word that there was not an essential, real, actual, and natural outpouring of the attributes," they can certainly prove this easily, but have thereby proved nothing against the Lutheran doctrine of the communication of the attributes; against this they can prove nothing from God's Word. With the promised proof they can, it is true, refute a Hofmann, who writes in his "Proof of Scripture," "He (Christ) ceased to be God fine in order to become man"; Hofmann alone has just ceased to be a Lutheran in order to become a Cenotist.

Now, lest anyone think that in the end it is only a theoretical difference in the doctrine of the person of Christ between the Lutherans and the Reformed, let us see what practical consequences they give to their doctrine.

By what thoughts is a Reformed man as such moved when he stands under the cross of the Son of God on Good Friday? In his Confession of Faith Zwingli writes: "Peter says that Christ suffered for us, since mankind alone could suffer." (Compare this saying of Zwingli with what Nestorius used to preach on Good Friday: "Boast not, thou Jew, that thou hast crucified God; thou hast not crucified God, but only a man," and the close blood relationship of the two immediately leaps to the eye). - Calvin: "I confess that if anyone wanted to oppose Christ to God's judgment per se, there would be no merit, because the worthiness that could earn God's favor would not be found in a man. Therefore, when Christ's merit is spoken of, the fundamental cause is not placed in him, but we ascend to the fact that God has so decreed it, which is the first cause." (According to Calvin, then, Christ's merit behaves like an ameri-

conical silver dollar. Nor does it have the value of a dollar "per se and as such," "but we go out to the fact that [the Congress] has decreed it so.) - Short appendix: "The Lutherans say that personal union always entails that everything said of Christ that he did or suffered must be understood by both natures; and that it is not true that Christ died according to human nature alone. We say this is Eutychian."

We could now, with easy difficulty, further prove that the Reformed, as they deny the fully sacrificial death of the Son of God, deny also that Christ is present on earth according to his human nature, that divine majesty and glory are communicated to his human nature, that Christ, inasmuch as he is a man, is to be worshipped, and much more. But the quotations 1) given will suffice for the purpose of this work. And louder than all the quotations speak the fruits which those Reformed principles have yielded. On the foundation laid by Zwingli, Calvin, and others, others have continued to build quite symmetrically. And what a building has come out of it! The Socinians, Unitarians, Universalists, Quakers, etc., in the consistent application of those Reformed principles, freely and openly deny the true deity of Christ, and declare it a blasphemy to hold Christ to be the one true God, coeternal with the Father. With quite the same reasons with which the Reformed "prove" the impossibility of a true personal union of the two natures in Christ, these "prove" the impossibility of the Trinity of God, overthrow every Christian article of faith, and make of the Christian religion a heathen doctrine of works in a Christian-sounding garb of phrases. The Reformed mind is precisely a mind that always denies, that by its very nature must deny all that God has spoken, that begins its "learning" in God's Word with the question, "Yea, should God have said?"

"Oh, Lord God, from such a blessed, comforting article (of Christ) one should always rejoice, sing, praise and thank God the Father for such unspeakable mercy, that he has let his dear Son become like us and our brother. Thus, through such proud, ambitious, desperate people, the Teusel causes such unpleasantness that our dear and blessed joy must be prevented and spoiled. May this be lamented to God. For we Christians must know this: where God is not in the balance and gives the weight, we sink with our bowl. So this is what I mean: where it should not be said, God died for us, but a man alone, we are lost. But if God's death and God died in the wagon bowl

1) On the above quotations, cf. Report d. Mich.-Distr. 1886 and 1888; Günther, Symbolik; Masius, **Diaskepsis**; Baier, Dogmatik.

he sinks, and we go up as a light, corpse-like bowl." (Luther, quoted in Baier III, 72.) And again Luther writes: "Let him (Christ) be God, how great and mighty he is; but lift up all here, and touch him, and say first, I know of no God but he that is given for me. So his majesty shall be sweet unto thee, when thou knowest that thou hast such a God as is given for thee, which holdeth heaven and earth in his hand; then shall no creature, nor that majesty, terrify thee: for that he is given for thee is the debt of his mercy and love: touch him here and there, and he also is soft and sweet." (Erl. 46, 216.) If we hold these sayings of Luther against the above quotations from Reformed writings, we are confronted with an antithesis of the Lutheran to the Reformed Church such as cannot be more sharply conceived, and that is an antithesis in the central question of the Christian religion, "How think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?" It is precisely on this core question that the position of the two churches is fundamentally different. The Lutheran Church believes, teaches, and confesses on the basis of Scripture: "The Word became flesh," the Second Person of the Holy Trinity really and truly became man, without, however, having ceased to be God. She believes, teaches, and confesses, in this JEsus Christ dwells the fullness of the Godhead, as in her own body. She believes from the heart. Reason may object what it will, that all that this Jesus Christ has done and suffered, God himself has done and suffered, that he lies with all his immeasurable Godhead in the manger and hangs on the cross, that from the moment of his conception no part of his Godhead is to be found outside his assumed humanity, nor will it be found for all eternity, and that he is now exalted according to his human nature to the right hand of the power and majesty of the Father, and now also according to this nature rules heaven and earth. All this the Lutheran Church believes, teaches, and confesses on the basis of the clear Scriptures: Col. 2, 9; Jn. 1, 14; 1 Tim. 3, 16; 1 Cor. 15, 47; Matth. 16, 13. 16; 1 Cor. 2, 8; 1 Jn. 1, 7; Apost. 20, 28, etc. St. Of all these blessed truths of God, in which alone a troubled conscience can find grace and comfort, the Reformed Church teaches the very opposite, as an examination of her doctrine shows. While confessing an omnipotent, invisible, infinite God, it seeks to circumscribe and measure this very God with the compass and rule of finite reason. Not from and according to God's word, but according to geometrical principles, it wants to judge of this heavenly doctrine, of this great, divine mystery of God's revelation in the flesh. Only that is to be possible which reason can conceive as possible; only that is to be true which lies within the periphery of the rationally comprehensible. No longer his will, but axioms of reason are to be the limit.

of the omnipotence of God. Since, according to reason, **finitum non est capax infiniti, it is** impossible that in Christ the infinite Godhead should be really and truly communicated to finite human nature.

And while one operates with such truths of reason against truths of Scripture, one comes into direct contradiction with himself, with his own principles. It is not at all remembered that human reason, too, is decidedly something finite, and therefore cannot possibly comprehend the infinite God, cannot possibly judge of his works; for these are higher than all reason. This is a contradiction which can be escaped only by the pantheistic conception of an absolute, general reason which thinks in all; which can be escaped only by supposing in man a spirit akin to the divine, which knows how to find out the truth approaching us from without, namely, from Scripture, from among the letters and images which conceal the truth.

Thus in the Reformed Church a spirit presents itself to us which empties the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God of its godly content; which even in Golgotha's consecrated place will not take off the coarse peasant shoes of carnal reason; to whom anguish and tears, cries and prayers, blood and death of the Crucified are only the martyrdom of a mere man, which was necessary because God had so decreed it, but in itself has no redeeming value; who on Good Friday can only rise to the carnal lament of the daughters of Jerusalem, but has no understanding of the Good Friday lament and the Good Friday consolation of a true Lutheran.

In short, anyone who, on the basis of Scripture, cannot sing with the Lutheran Church from the depths of his heart, "O wonder without measure, if you look at it right, the Lord allowed Himself to be martyred for 'His servant'; the true God gave Himself to death for me, a lost sinner!" has indeed a "different spirit.

(To be continued.)

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## 1. America.

**Statement of the Iowa Synod on its Relationship to the Council.** The Ohio "Kirchenzeitung" writes p. 543 f.: "In regard to the desire of the Ohio Synod to receive an official statement on the relationship of the Iowa Synod to the General Council, the Iowa Synod has made the following reply of the Honorable President Richter its own and has had it transmitted to our Synod: 'From the very beginning the Iowa Synod has acknowledged the confessional basis of the General Council to be completely satisfactory, and it would have probably already in the days of the foundation of the General Council

The Iowa Confession would not have been adhered to by the members had it not been for questions of church practice and related principles in the General Council that contradicted this basis of confession. Iowa therefore took a waiting position, and our delegates had only "**the privilege of the floor**". This relationship, however, included church fellowship, which was also practiced by our delegates in pulpit and altar fellowship. When the Galesburg Rule was adopted in 1875, the last obstacle to our joining the General Council had fallen in principle. Thus Iowa was confronted with the question whether it wanted to join the General Council or not. Some emphasized that the Galesburg Rule was often violated and that therefore an affiliation was out of the question; others said that violations of the basis of the confession and its practical realization occurred everywhere in the visible church, and that one should not judge pharisaically, but should be able to bear weaknesses. Thus, in 1885, at the meeting of the General Synod, there was a motion to join the General Council. The motion was defeated, but the Iowa Synod expressly declared that "no denominational reasons would prevent us from affiliating with the same, but that the question in regard to affiliation is merely one of ecclesiastical convenience and expediency." Soon thereafter the General Council was not attended by delegates; but there was always occasional activity on the part of the church community. For instance, D. H. W. Roth preached at the funeral of D. G. Fritschel, and again at that of D. S. Fritschel, and other instances of pulpit fellowship will have occurred. While the Synod had, and still has, reasons for not joining the General Council, it recognized the General Council as a part of the orthodox Lutheran Church in America; it deplored the "cases" that kept occurring and causing trouble, but it also recognized that these "cases" were in conflict with the public principles of the General Council. In 1902 the General Council sent a visitor to the Iowa Synod, and we also decided to elect a visitor to the General Council, and since then there has been a so-called exchange of delegates, which in our case is an expression of church fellowship. However, the question has also been raised with us: Is the General Council in communion with the General Synod? The officials of the General Council answer this question in the negative, and yet facts are reported which seem to answer this question in the affirmative. If the General Council itself were to answer this question in the affirmative-and at Buffalo, it is hoped, it will come to a clear decision-we would have to sever our relations with the General Council; even then our relation to the General Council would have to change if it avoided answering the question. If, however, the General Council takes the right position in accordance with the basis of its confession, and in general presses more and more for the implementation of its sound principles, there would, in my opinion, be no reason for us to denounce the General Council's communion of faith; on the contrary, we should rejoice that such an important part of our Church, which has placed itself so resolutely on the dear confession of our Church, demands and more and more implements a strict implementation of the right principles also in church life and in every practice.'" Praeses Schutte submitted this answer to the convention meeting at Richmond, Ind.

to the General Synod of Ohio, with the remark, "There should now, on our part, be a final conclusion to the negotiations of mutual recognition. This, I think, we owe to the Iowa Synod; and well to ourselves, inasmuch as it behooves us to put an end to every occasion of discord in this matter." That the Iowans have for years identified themselves with the council, nay, celebrated it as the best representation of Lutheranism in America, is well known. And if the Ohioans do not wish to leave again the course taken with the Toledo Union Theses, they cannot logically deny church fellowship to the Iowans now, and so to the conciliarists. F. B.

**The Lutheran Observer writes of the General Synod's mission effectiveness**: "Its peculiar adaptations for the task of gathering in and ministering to this great host of anglicized or anglicizing but as yet unchurched Lutherans, are due to its happy combination of the distinctive Lutheran faith with catholicity of spirit and the cordial way in which it has always sought to adjust itself to the conditions and problems of American life. Whatever mistakes the General Synod may have made in the course of its development, it has always realized that the vigor of its life and the efficiency of its service must necessarily be conditioned by its adaptation to its environment. It has ever clearly seen that the priceless ecclesiastical heritage which has come to it by way of the German Fatherland must be sympathetically and intelligently related to the circumstances of a new land and time. After the manner of the Christian apologists who have been accustomed to see an evidence of the divine origin and truth of Christianity in its universality, - its ability to relate itself to any environment, to bear transplanting into any land and to exhibit its saving power as its message is translated into any tongue,- so the General Synod has believed that the truth and life for which Lutheranism stands can be related to the peculiar conditions and spirit of this or any other land. It has realized that only by adapting the unchanged truths to which it witnesses to the ever-changing circumstances of the sphere and place where it must preach and work, will these truths win their legitimate response from the hearts of men - that the message which men will hear and to which they will give heed is a message addressed to the needs of the day in the forms of thought and language of the day. Hence the adaptation of the General Synod for Home Mission work among Anglicizing but still unchurched Lutherans in America. It comes to them confessing the faith of their fathers in its distinctiveness and fullness, but with catholicity of spirit, in sympathy with American conditions and problems, and relating its activities to American needs and environment." What does this mean? The history of the General Synod and its most distinguished representatives testifies to an almost uninterrupted denial of Lutheran doctrines and multiple inclinations toward the Reformed errors of the Lord's Supper, baptism, and absolution, to continued unionism and practical denial of Lutheranism through fraternization in pulpit and communion with almost all sects, and especially through the most lax lodge practice, the introduction of Methodist conversion measures, and so on. Is it this laxism that the *Observer* thinks of when he praises the "Catholicism of the Spirit" that has ever made the General Synod exquisitely Lutheran?

qualified for missionary work? The General Synodists should tell us clearly whether or not they really want to break with their unionist, thoroughly un-Lutheran past. The resolutions passed since 1895 speak in favor of it, but numerous facts and also debates in General Synodist journals speak against it. Without a break with the past, however, and without the pastors and congregations of the General Synod really plowing a new ground, the declarations of 1895, 1901, and 1909 will remain empty appearances without an inner being. To the above words of the *Lutheran Observer,* the *Lutheran World* also notes, "We have had some great history made by efforts at seeking an 'adaptation to its environment.' There was a period, for example, back in the forties, when some Lutheran churches tried this method of 'adaptation' to the wild-fire revivalism that was at that time the dominating note in the 'environment' of Lutheran and Reformed churches. Such churches adapted themselves to the environment, and many of them have long since ceased to have even a name to live. It all depends on what such phraseology is intended to mean." So out with the language! Does the *Observer* want General Synod in the future to model its doctrine and practice on God's Word and the Lutheran Confession, or, as has so often been the case in the past, on circumstances? F. B.

**From the "Magazin für Evangelische Theologie und Kirche" (Magazine for Protestant Theology and Church)** the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" quotes among others the following passages: "The Protestant Church of North America calls itself a daughter of the German Union Church, and certainly rightly so. It is not, however, in all respects modeled on or similar to the German church." "Our confessional paragraph is not a straitjacket binding us to the wording of the symbols, nor do we believe that the medieval concept of verbal inspiration must be binding for all time on every true Christian: this gives us a free position toward both the Bible and the symbols." Essentially the same position on Scripture and symbol is held in Prussia by the "Reformation" and similarly directed papers of the Prussian Union. F. B.

**Baptism by sprinkling among Baptists**. From Baptist *World*, the *Lutheran Observer* quotes: "We hold that to 'aid and abet' the sprinkling of infants is a heresy which has cursed the churches of Christ through the centuries; which introduces the priest idea, of a human mediator between the individual and Christ; which indorses the mockery of a proxy faith for a helpless infant; and further, to 'aid and abet' the substitution of another act for immersion, which Christ expressly commanded, and which He intended should symbolize His ultimatum for the death of the flesh and the resurrection of a new life, is, at least, not becoming a Baptist. Our ruling was and is, that being pastor of the 'Moody Church' and presiding over sprinkling exercises of adults and of infants, 'and pronouncing the benediction over them,' 'aids and abets' others in the violation of Bible inspiration." This failure was prompted by the fact that D. Dixon of Moody Baptist Church in Chicago sometimes consecrates (dedicates) infants by sprinkling. But the Baptist *Journal and Messenger* remarks: "How only the *Baptist World* could judge so harshly of Dixon, since it itself fancies the "*Baptist World* Congress," of which many Baptist pastors are members, who are in sympathy with the

Baptism just as Dixon did. - To these Baptists their doctrine of baptism, on the basis of which they have caused division in Christendom, is evidently not in their conscience. The driving principle with them is the sectarian and divisive spirit; therefore, if "immersion" no longer serves this purpose, sprinkling takes its place. F. B.

"Reunion of Christianity" is now a phrase often heard, especially among Episcopalians. What they mean, however, is that the other churches should join the Episcopal Church, or rather recognize its "historic Episcopacy". Bishop Strange of North Carolina also diligently makes speeches about "Christian union"; but how he understands this is evident from the following words, which are communicated by *Lutheran Witness*. Bishop Strange says: "Shall we go with our Christian brethren to their churches and take communion with them from the hands of their own ministers? No, we shall not, for three reasons: First, because we cannot in conscience admit the right to exercise the full functions of the ministry to those who cannot trace their full authority back to the Reformation; second, because for full 1500 years in the Church of Christ, as far as we can find, no man regularly administered the Holy Communion who had not been ordained by a bishop; thirdly, because such action on our part would destroy all hope of unity with the millions of the Greek and Roman churches. Shall we join with our Christian brethren in common evangelistic meetings for the conversion of men to Christ, such as the meetings lately conducted in this city by Mr. Torrey? I think not. My experience and investigation lead me to conclude that we differ so much in matters of detail, that our point of view in many practical matters of Christian life is so wide apart that it does not make for the edification of our own people or for the good and harmony of the Christian community for us to join in these great revivals. It is my opinon - my opinion shared by many leading Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian ministers - that more good is accomplished by each Christian body holding its own revivals in its own way. On the other hand, what shall we do? Shall we invite our Christian brethren, members of their own churches, to come and commune with us ? Yes, invite them privately and publicly. The question is altogether different from our not receiving the Holy Communion from the hands of their ministers; there is now no question of authority and church principle between us; we acknowledge that they are Christians, as good, and perhaps better than we are; we accept the fact that by Baptism they are members of the Holy Catholic Church; we love to have them at the Lord's, not our, table with us; we would love to go with them if we could." The pious talk of "Christian union" is evidently, in the mouths of many sects, nothing more than a bait to catch the simple-minded. In New York the Episcopalians have formed a committee of six bishops, six presbyters, and twelve laymen to make propaganda for the "reunion of Christendom." Among the bishops involved are Doane of Albany and Greer of New York. F- B.

**Of the position of local Methodist congregations and their pastors on the annual conference,** the Methodist "Journal of Theology and Church" writes: "The most important event for preachers and congregations in the Methodist Church is the annual conference. This is due to several reasons. First, it should be noted that no congregation for itself

...is standing there by itself. It forms only a part of the conference. As the various wards and districts stand to the city, so the individual congregations stand to the conference. But the same is true of the preachers. No one stands alone, independent of the others. His membership in the church rests in the conference. As a member of it alone he has fine office as a preacher. There he is responsible. There his character, moral as well as official, is yearly publicly tested. There he receives his appointment from year to year; and the Conference retires him. In our country there are about 120 such conferences. They are held partly in the spring, partly in the autumn. Most of the German ones are held in the autumn. But they have no legislative power at all, only administrative. The local congregation has nothing to do with the election of a preacher. It gets the same one, without its intervention, from the conference. Nor does the preacher have anything to do with the choice of an appointment. It is simply given to him. Now such a system has its difficulties, of course. It is by no means perfect. But it prevents much friction and worry and heartache." The Methodists are not concerned with the divine rights of local churches. F. B.

**Roman vituperations.** From a catechism published by Benziger Brothers and approved by Cardinal Gibbons, *The Converted Catholic of* 1909 quotes as follows: "Question: Who caused so many bad Catholics to fall away from the Catholic faith? Answer: 1. Martin Luther, a bad Catholic priest in Germany; he was the founder of the German Lutherans. 2. Henry VIII, a wicked Catholic King of England; he was the founder of the Episcopalians. 3. John Calvin, a wicked Catholic of France; he was the founder of the Calvinists. 4. John Knox, a bad Catholic Prince of Scotland; he was the founder of the Presbyterians and Puritans. Question: What do Protestants believe? Answer: Protestants believe whatever they choose to believe, and therefore we see so many kinds of Protestants." The expression "bad Catholic" gives the priest room enough to put on all the lies of Döllinger, Janssen, Denifle, and Pius X, and to inculcate them in his young papal servants as an antidote to Lutheranism. F. B.

**Bible Reading in State Schools.** The Illinois Supreme Court has now also ruled that the Bible may not be read in the public schools. The impetus for this came from the Romanists, who now rejoice over their victory and at the same time pose as the real representatives of the American separation of church and state, while the sects and also the ***Lutheran Observer*** lament this judgment and thereby only betray that they still have no understanding for the most glorious jewel of our American state constitution, the complete freedom of religion and equality, the prerequisite of which is precisely the complete lack of religion in the state schools. But as for the Papists, their joy does not spring from a love of toleration, or from the conviction that it is wrong to abuse State power and money to enforce and propagate their own religious doctrines, and to suppress those of their opponents. If the same Romanists who now pose as the patrons of American liberty could impose their religion on the state schools without harm to themselves, they would do so as obedient servants of the Pope, and their rejoicing would then be even greater,

Than he is now. If only they had then achieved what their "holy father" demands of them, and what Pius X now insists upon so vigorously in Spain, that he incites the people to revolution and rebellion, if the Spanish government dares to touch this autocracy of the Catholic religion in all public churches and schools. And as long as the sects and the ***Lutheran Observer*** do not see to it that, though in their

As long as the Catholic Churches do not tolerate any false doctrine and false religion and thus only the pure Gospel is tolerated, and conversely every religion is equally tolerated in the state and therefore no religious instruction is tolerated in the state schools, so long they only work into the hands of the intolerance and presumption of the Papal Church. F. B.

**The Pseudo-Pastors in Brazil. The** Reformation writes: "But the great multitude of pseudo-pastors were adventurers of the saddest kind; without any previous training, without being suited to it by their character and conduct, they had taken over the parish office and teaching office in order to do a shameful trade with ecclesiastical official acts. The 'parson' read a sermon in the church service, probably also stooped to his own sermon reflections, which were, however, very strange for a Christian church service; he baptized the children, married the couples; Then he took off his gown and served his parishioners with beer and kaschassa, the heavy, dangerous sugar cane liquor, at his own sounding board, or took them from the 'Kerch' to the nearby 'Vendax' (business and tavern) for drinks and games and dancing, and then probably mocked himself, to the amusement of his listeners, the sermon he had just preached or read. I could tell you some unbelievable stories about the activities of these pseudo-pastors, but let me refrain from doing so! One may well ask: How is such a thing possible? How could people put up with such things? But these were people who had grown up without church and school, who had no idea of the importance of the Christian church and the Protestant pastorate. They had heard from their parents that in Germany it was customary to go to church on Sundays in order to hear a sermon, that the children were to be baptized, and so on. They had this from their pastor, whom they paid for it with their good money; and, as they found out to their joy, they had their pastor cheaply; he got perhaps 200 to 400 marks a year! Had he become too exacting, they would have employed another who would have done it cheaper. The Catholic Brazilian State, however, did not care for its new Protestant citizens; it tolerated the 'heretics,' allowed them to elect their pastors as soon as fifty men declared themselves in favor of one, and to charge him with the keeping of the civil registers; only they were not allowed to come forward publicly with their worship, they were not allowed to build churches recognizable as such, they were not allowed to ring bells, etc. With what contempt may the Catholics in Brazil, German and Brazilian, have looked upon the shameful ecclesiastical conditions of their German Protestant fellow-citizens, whether even in their own house many things were imperfect and rotten!" Judging from some remarks of German papers, however, many in Germany would have preferred that the pseudo-pastors had continued their economy, rather than that faithful Lutheran congregations should now be raised up in Brazil by Missourians. F. B.

## II. foreign countries.

**"World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress."** This is the name now given to the "Unitarian World Congress," which met in London in 1901, in Amsterdam in 1903, in Geneva in 1905, in Boston in 1907, and this year in Berlin from August 5 to 10. Rade writes in the "Chr. W.": "The memory of the Unitarian origin of the Congresses has, at the request of the Unitarians themselves, been finally deleted from the name of the Congress: an act of the most voluntary self-denial, which has certainly not come easily to the Unitarians and which does them great honour. For it is to their credit that they have hitherto substantially carried the work of the Congresses. But now that these congresses have gained a firm foothold in Protestant countries all over Europe, they have become an independent institution, breaking the fetters of their origin where this could become a fetter. Thus also in the leading committee of the congress men from churches and directions have been elected, who extend the scope far; before they have finally accepted, I am not authorized to say anything more about it. On the other hand, the question of whether to open representation on the committee to non-Christian kindred spirits has been unanimously postponed to a future meeting." Rade spoke about the new name as follows: "The Congress calls itself a World Congress for 'Free Christianity and Religious Progress,' a name about which there has been much scolding and which was adopted only by majority vote. But he thought it was good and not phrasal, and thought something of the words "free Christianity," "religious progress." "Our 'mission'" -- Rade continues literally -- "is not so powerful and so blessed that it did not gladly hope and count on a concession of development rooted in its own soil of foreign religions. In particular, the relation to Judaism cannot possibly be settled merely by the way of the mission to the Jews." The new name, therefore, does not mean a swing from the Unitarian to the evangelical standpoint, but a step even beyond Unitarianism. Out of theism and pantheism, out of "Christianity," Judaism, Mohammedanism, and other heathen religions, a new union and world religion is to be brewed. The main theme of the programme was therefore also: "The sympathetic relations that should exist between the religious communities." And they are quite appropriate phrases with which the "Protestant Gazette" welcomed the Berlin Congress: "Greetings! We believe in a community of free and pious spirits in all the world, and among all peoples the same longing for God drives human hearts to their own free flight to heaven. Greetings, then, you who, like us, want to live by your own faith, which springs from the innermost part of our inner life!"

**The composition of the congress** corresponded to this purpose. Rade writes: "Orthodox, Catholics, freethinkers, Jews, own people of the religious preaching, also men from the heathen world, who are not far from the kingdom of God. A motley company, and yet, one would like to have it still more motley!" About 140 speeches were held. Among others, Rabbis Hirsch of Chicago, Montefiore of London, Cohen of Marburg, a Buddhist, an Indian theist and a Sikh theologian spoke.

Confessors. In Germany the following participated in the formation of the League: the Protestant Association, the Friends of the "Christian World," the publishers of popular books on the history of religion, the Association of Friends of Christian Liberty in Rhineland and Westphalia and in Hanover, and the liberal lecturers in Germany and Switzerland had come in large numbers to the meeting in Berlin. Of Harnack, Titius, Baumgarten, and Tröltsch, Rade remarks: "These to the least the strangers have also had to gout." The invitation to the Congress had also been co-signed by D. Beth, who has been celebrated many times as a leader of the Positives and exponent of Seeberg's theology. The Evangelical Association (Centre Party), which still wants to be considered quasi-positive, was also represented. Lasson of Berlin is named as the conservative speaker at the Congress, but, as Rade says, he indulged in "sometimes rather massive and invective remarks." From the Catholic Church figured the Modernists Funk of Stettin and Murri of Rome. Nor were representatives of the Mennonites, Baptists, Methodists and the Evangelical Fellowship absent. Of the more than 700 participants, 180 were from America. Rade was especially pleased with the presence of Unitarians, Jews, Buddhists, Hindus, and also the son of the great Eliot of Harvard, the well-known prophet of the new religion of the future. Of the speech of Cohen the Jew, Rade says: "The clear and sharp speech of Cohen was for many among the events of the Congress. To the best of my recollection, thinking Jewry has hardly ever appeared in Germany in such a scientific and religiously aggressive manner as in this speech. In all communion with the Protestant-Kant culture, which can hardly be more strongly affirmed than in the vigorous assertion of what the world owed to Judaism and what Judaism had before Christianity." One can see how Rade almost regrets not being a Reform Jew himself. Rabbi Hirsch elaborated, "The modern Jews do not pass over, but they join, for they feel themselves akin in essence to liberal Christianity, and the Holy Spirit of ancient prophecy blows in modern Judaism as in liberal Christianity." For his proof that liberalism was nothing more than Judaized Christianity, Hirsch earned the stormy applause of the liberal assembly. The proof that Rabbi Hirsch had hit the nail on the head was given by none other than Harnack in his lecture on the double Gospel, the Gospel of Jesus, the content of which was only the Father, and the Gospel of Paul of the atoning death of Jesus.

Rade writes **about the success of the religious menagerie organized in Berlin**: "The success of the world congress in Berlin was no longer doubtful to us, since the call for it was supported by so many (700) and such considerable names. But the actual course of events surpassed everything that could have been hoped for. We had more than one meeting, in which at least 1600 people filled the hall and held out for hours. In the evening until about midnight and early 9 one was also back in the place." The "Reformation" says: "Outwardly viewed, the success of the World Congress was exceedingly successful. In the wonderful Landwehrhroffiziers, which is extraordinarily suitable for such an event.

Kasino am Zoologischen Garten was like a fairground during the congress days from early morning until late evening. The large halls were mostly overcrowded, even when one or more parallel meetings were being held. Besides the numerous foreigners, Americans, Britons, Danes, Scandinavians, Dutch, Belgians, French, Swiss, Italians, Hungarians, Baltic provincials, the exotic plants from India, China and Japan and from Oceania, partly in their original costumes, besides clergymen and laymen from all German regional churches and all Prussian provinces, also the Berliners, especially from Berlin and the suburbs along the Wannsee railway, appeared in large numbers. And the fair femininity in silken robes with gold-ringed fingersI East it would seem to us as if they were even represented in preponderant numbers. Only the wicked Orthodox stood for the most part aloof, or took part only in single representatives or in single events! The three popular meetings on Sunday evening, in which the Berlin ecclesiastical liberalism held parades, recruited adherents, and called for a bold onslaught against the national church, were also crowded. Who should not be interested, too, to come face to face for once with all those men who had hitherto been known to him only from the newspapers as a 'case'? P. Heyn-Greifswald, Götz-Dortmund, César-Wiesenthal, Jatho-Cologne, Traub-Dortmund, Kurt Stage-Hamburg, Geyer-Nuremberg, who represented Ritteimeyer at the same time, Liebster-Leipzig, Lipsius-Bremen! W. Claaßen-Hamburg, Graf Hönsbröch, Lhotzky, Lily Braun and other fanatical, radical, unclear spirits were not lacking either. Whoever had at any time had a conflict with the Landeskirche or the ecclesiastical authorities came and listened with satisfaction to the sometimes mockingly superficial or principally radical criticisms and attacks on the Prussian Landeskirche, the authorities, the orthodox and the dogmas in the absence of their representatives. Whoever made any claim to education and progress felt himself elevated by the mass of the educated and advanced! Who knows the peoples, names the names, who all came together here?"

But the **great liberal effort was** not matched by results. The "Frankfurter Zeitung" says that the Congress did not satisfy the expectations of those who had hoped that it would mark the beginning of a new religion as a church, "a religion as a church in a modern sense, which would unite all those who are progressive, but still religiously minded, and as a whole would be able to confront the existing orthodox churches. But Rade is right when he remarks that the "Frankfurter Zeitung" should not have expected so much from the Berlin Congress. Liberalism is just as incapable of creating a new religion as smallpox, plague and bacilli are of creating a new man. Liberalism lives and exists only as a parasite on the body of the church! What rust is to iron, what deformity and corruption are to the human body, that and only that is liberalism in Christendom. Rade thinks that the result of the Congress is to be sought in the tendency to exercise tolerant sentiments and practices in matters of religion and church policy. Indeed, little wool with so much clamor! But one thing the Congress did accomplish: it made Christianity stink before Jews and heathens! The notorious Fischer said with reference to the

Congress: "On the dogma of the divinity of Christ hangs all and every ecclesiasticism . . . Our liberty consists in redeeming this dogma to the ground." And this goal the representatives of this Congress have also achieved. The Holy Scriptures, the Word of God, and JEsum, the Son of the living God, whom the Scriptures preach as the only Saviour of the world, this Congress has trampled under foot, and called upon all the heathen and Christian world to do the same. Down to the ground it has dissolved Christianity with its dogmas.

**The only gain that this congress has brought is that it has given** new proof that liberalism, which rejects Christ and yet wants to be "Christian," not only destroys the foundations of faith and morals, but also so spiritually flattens, corrupts, and jesuits man that he loses all sense of the opposition of yes and no, of truth and lie. The "Reformation" reports, "But the inner success (of the Congress)? A Pentecost it was not, where God's Holy Spirit spoke through all the disciples of JEsu in one language, where all understood each other in the spirit of one faith, one love, one hope! Rather a Babel, where one did not understand the language of the other. Only one difference! We have become more educated, we know how to listen even when we don't understand or disagree. Yes, even more, we know how to pretend that we understand everything. How else would we accompany the speakers, whom we greeted with clapping hands even when we did not know them, and listened to with suppressed yawns because we did not understand them, with even more lively applause when they departed? O on our educated untruthfulness! Or should it be a lack of understanding when the same people who cheered the Social Democrat Maurenbrecher and applauded Geh. Rat Cohen-Marburg, who was earnestly promoting Judaism, likewise applauded the sole representative of the positive Christian faith, Geh. Rat Lasson, whose words came down like blows of a club on the heads of the organizers of the Congress? Was it a lack of comprehension or of truthfulness when the same assembly gave raging applause to the religious individualist Schrempf, who, from the point of view of the great metamorphosis in which he now believes, recognizes all earthly values in their absolute unworthiness, and immediately afterwards to the other individualist Lhotzky, who called for work in this world? ('Take care of today, place it in the obedience of God! Thus you provide for your eternity. Whether it really comes tomorrow or not is all the same to me!') Rousing applause of hands easily helped over all deep and sharp contrasts of spirits! Our general impression? As Wagner says to Mephisto: 'All this makes me so stupid, as if a mill wheel were going round in my head!

**The Presidium of the Cogitant Alliance in Berlin** had addressed the following letter to the Unitarian World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress: "If the World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress really has the latter in mind, it must be reminded that no true progress can be achieved through mere half measures, even in the religious field. The main defect of traditional religions is that they no longer correspond to what we are able to accept as truth according to the present state of science.

The religions with stereotyped, scientifically untenable beliefs have so outlived themselves that mere patchwork cannot possibly suffice to revive them. The never-obsolete religion of the future can only be cogitantism, that is, the religion of progressive, best knowledge, or the religion of knowledge and the expansion of knowledge. If, therefore, the World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress earnestly aspires to the latter, it can best manifest this by open and explicit affiliation with the Cogitant Alliance, to which it is hereby urged." The "Ref." remarks on this: "The Unitarian Congress has only bashfully introduced itself into Germany. It is assured once and again that it does not want to be an attack on the churches, etc. It only wants to serve religious progress. It only wants to serve religious progress and to set in motion a strong religious wave in Berlin. With this soft tone of half-measures he has now aroused the displeasure of the resolute. With full justification. If one wants to introduce something other than what one is, one arouses distrust and ill-feeling. " F. B.

**"A great encyclopedia of the aberrations of all ecclesiastical theologians."** Friedrich Naumann, who no longer believes a single one of the actually Christian articles, writes in the "Christliche Welt": He adheres to the national church because a break with it would mean a break with the soul life of his forefathers and his youth. May this church still have so many defects: he was born into it, as into his nation! We lack the prerequisites for a new form of religion; what remains but to continue to bear in patience the burden of the church that has become stiff and hard? But the opinion is foolish: either one must believe everything that the church believes, or separate oneself from it. "What then does the church believe? About what is written in the Confessions? She does not think about it! Even the Orthodox are not literalists. One of the most necessary theological works is a detailed, scientifically accurate work on where orthodox believers depart from church doctrine. Nothing is done here with little gel'egenheit hints, but we need a great encyclopedia of the aberrations of all ecclesiastical theologians. This, in its massiness, will produce the impression that today there is only a church of letters in appearance. But once this spell is broken, the embarrassing feeling will fall away even among the freer members, as if they were still in the church only through a kind of untruthfulness. This feeling is historically false. A Church which has already borne within itself all the rationalism of the Age of Enlightenment, to which the Lessings have belonged as well as the Goetzes, to which the great philosophers and teachers of history of the last century have belonged, must not be regarded as a closed association for circumscribed orthodoxy. To any one who would so represent the Church to us, we say that he does not know her history." On this the "Reformation" remarks: "Naumann is quite right, so far as he speaks as a church member. The national church is the field of labor for the ministers of the gospel. Let no one, therefore, be cast out who does not exclude himself." In the national church, then, not merely according to Naumann, but also according to the "Reformation," every one has a good right, no matter what he believes. It is only a "field of labor," i. e. not a church, but a world. The "Reformation" still remarks: "On the great lexicon for the aberrations of ecclesiastical theologians are

we eagerly." The fact is that there is not a single theologian in the German universities who would not find admission into this lexicon on account of his deviations from the symbols. In "Lehre und Wehre" this has also already been proved to a great extent. R. Seeberg, meaning the "Reformation," would not, at any rate, come into this lexicon. But, e. g., p. 18 of the "Reformation," Seeberg himself furnishes proof that he even errs in the doctrine of the Trinity. F. B.

**Academic freedom of teaching and confession of the church.** Prof. Zovanyi at the University of the Reformed Hungarian Church in Sarospatak had publicly attacked Calvin and his teachings in his lectures. Thereupon the Reformed congregations on this side of the Tisza demanded that the university authorities take action against him. On September 22, 1908, he was suspended from his position as professor at the university. Zovanyi appealed to a higher court and demanded that his trial be heard in the Danube region, since he could not count on an impartial verdict at home. His request was granted. The interrogation began in the spring of 1909, and in October of the same year the court gave its judgment in the case, as a result of which Zovanyi was finally deprived of his office and granted only a half pension. In his defence Prof. Zovanyi had invoked the principle, so popular with academics today, that academic teaching must be free and unfettered. To this the court in its judgment made the following excellent reply: "A professor in the theological faculty of a Reformed university serves the (Reformed) Church and is not paid by it so that he may fight its faith, but so that he may prove himself a faithful servant of the Church and its teachings. Should his convictions and the teachings based on them now come into conflict with the Church and her teachings, and should he therefore as a result no longer be able to serve the Church faithfully, he is bound in his conscience to submit his resignation. The Hungarian Church is a living organism, which, if it wishes to continue to exist, must not tolerate such activity on the part of the teachers paid by it, under cover of its authority, as must ultimately result in the ruin of its community. " I. A. F.

**In Prussia, the General Synod had** decided to ask the Protestant High Church Council to submit a bill to the district synods to put a stop to the spread of religious radicalism in the elementary schools. Instead of complying with this request, the Oberkirchenrat asked the district synods to negotiate on the question of how the Christian home could support Christian youth education in schools and churches. Yes, in the Rhine Province the Superintendent was instructed by the Oberkirchenrat to see to it that public negotiations about religious instruction in the elementary schools were prevented. The Oberkirchenrat evidently fears the bees' nest of the liberals. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "If one now asks what caused the Protestant High Church Council to thwart the actual purpose which the General Synod had in mind by the wording of the Proponendum, there is hardly anything left but this: it was the fearful consideration of modern theology and the present spirit of the times. One does not want a popular movement that would oppose the aspirations of the liberal teacher-

world; one wants to have peace. The powers that are stirring in modern theology and in the whole modern worldview are to be spared. It is hoped and believed that the wild waters will run away of themselves. Otherwise we cannot understand the measure of the supreme church authority. Who would deny that modern theology and the radicalism of the teaching world are siblings? The liberal teachers have lost all respect for the Word of God through the work of modern theology. There is no revelation of God, no prophecy, no miracle, no intervention of God in history, in the life of man; all is essentially natural development. If the scholars in the universities are so enlightened that they deal with the Bible as with any other book, should not the teachers also be so? What is the use of the Bible and the catechism in the elementary school? Should not those who exercise the office of watchmen in the church be called in the first place to sound the trumpets in order to gather the people, since it is necessary to preserve for the national church its first and best supports? But no, peace, quiet! that is the watchword. But if the Christian school is lost, so is the national church; and what will then stand fast, if our people are dechristianized by the school? Surely these are serious questions, and cannot be dismissed in dealing with this matter."

**The almost diabolical way in which the teachers of Saxony are** now trying to rob the children of their faith in the facts of salvation, even in the teaching of biblical history, is shown by the following omission from the "Leipziger Lehrerzeitung". It writes, apparently in response to the government's declaration that there can be no question of a non-denominational elementary school: "One demands dogmatic religious instruction, but at the same time it should also be psychological, childlike. Good! The first commandment reads: 'I am the Lord thy God? First of all, the concept of 'God' is to be presented to the children as it appears to us in the Bible. So the children would read: The story of Paradise, how God makes Adam out of an earthen lump and Eve out of Adam's rib, how he walks lustily in the garden in the cool of the evening and the first men hear the footsteps of God; further, how God, after the flood of sin, regrets having made men, but how he then smelled with pleasure the lovely dust of the sacrifice which Noah brings him. It is obviously childish to speak of the 'nose' of God. Further on the children have to learn that God ate cakes and roasts with Abraham etc. There are many more examples of God being angry, long-suffering, patient and of great goodness. A children's denominational lesson must look like the one that has been outlined here. To make the great public see clearly in this respect is one of the most important duties of the teaching profession in the near future." Likewise, the aforementioned teachers' journal takes up arms against the miracles of the Lord, especially against the miracle of all miracles, His bodily resurrection, and treats them "openly and honestly" as legends. For example, it recommends treating the Lord's walking on the sea in the following way: "Let us think ourselves into the mood of the disciples! Some could not find words enough to recall the previous hours of comfort; others were silent, deeply moved by the greatness of their Master.

And through all the souls trembled one thought: What manner of man is this! So the hours pass. Already it begins to dawn. The morning mists still linger on the lake. Now the sun rises. Rays break through the fog victoriously. And in the brightness of the morning sun, they see their Lord and Master walking before them. They think he is walking on the sea and want to take him into the ship. But at the same moment the ship came up against the land to which they were going. The story soon turned the apparent walking on the sea into a real one." And quite similarly the resurrection of the Lord is interpreted: the disciples only thought they saw him, he only lived on in their hearts. It is said of the forty days between Easter and the Ascension, "During this time the disciples fare as parents do who have lost a child by sudden death. Just as the parents cannot believe that their darling can no longer be with them, just as they think they hear their child's voice early in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, just as they think they feel the gentle caresses and the pressure of his hand, so it is incomprehensible to the disciples that their Lord should be dead. How often they "saw" and "heard" their beloved Master, and especially in the twilight hours "he often stood among them" and "spoke with them. Finally, however, it becomes a certainty to the parents that their child has been taken away from them. Perhaps they have even once seen him standing sadly before them and heard the pleading words: "Weep not, be comforted, I am well; only your tears grieve me. They then regained new courage to live, and in their daily work they gradually forgot their pain; but their little darling, he lives on in their hearts as a pure, transfigured being, and remains unforgettable to them." The "C. K. Z." remarks: "If such attacks against the Bible are not countered by the superior authorities, then there will be a rupture." Let us hope so! F. B.

**"The Red Catechism."** The "E. K. Z." writes: "The numerous hateful attacks which the Ev.-Luth. Schulderem in Saxony has received on account of its 'Red Catechism' have induced the secretary of the association, P. Müller (Dresden), to have his lecture, held against the attacks of the notorious teacher Arzt, published in print under the title: 'The Red Catechism - Truth or Lie.' It is to be assumed that this lecture will find the same circulation as the Scripture on which it is based, 80,000 copies of which have already been distributed, and which is proved to be true from the first to the last word by this defence. At the end of the lecture Father Müller calls out to the teachers: "The teachers of Saxony are now standing at the most serious crossroads they have ever stood at. The goals to which the radical leaders wanted to lead their multitudes, accustomed to loyal following, were still veiled. Since the Red Catechism shone into the resolutions of January 3, the veil has fallen. Every Saxon teacher can now see clearly where the journey is leading. The red booklet is erected like a flaming warning signal. Many a one who has seen it has jumped aside, frightened, and recited obedience to the leaders. Now we have one wish for the leaders: that they would finally fight with open sights. Even then we would still have to stand up against the efforts of the radicals, and we would continue to do so.

But we would be spared one thing: that we are forced to tear the mask off the face of the opponent whom we are fighting.'" In the "Red Catechism" are printed in red all the passages and sayings which the liberal Saxon teachers wish to see expunged from the present Saxon Catechism. This visual lesson has opened the eyes of many. F. B.

**"The Reformed clergy in Saxony are** now doing their utmost in the struggle against positive Christianity; they seem to regard it as their chief task, and to feel themselves virtually pioneers of modern Christianity in backward Lutheran Saxony. The Dresden Protestant Association has for some time been essentially the domain of the Reformed clergy there; their lectures are not much inferior to the incendiary speeches of the monistic itinerant preachers." So writes the "S. K.- u. Schbl." The leader of these radical Reformers is D. Kaußsch, who has now called upon the Lutherans to follow the Reformed congregations in Leipzig and Dresden, who have removed the Apostolic from the service. F. B.

**Monistic pastors in the regional churches. In place** of the Bible-believing Father Weser, the Berlin magistrate appointed the monistic-minded Father Graue from Brandenburg to the old St. Mary's Church. In a fine inaugural sermon, according to the "Reformation," he said nothing that a Reform Jew could not have said. At the Protestant Day in Bremen he announced his attitude: "There are many theologians and pastors to whom monistic thinking comes quite naturally from their student days. But we remain in the church and claim our right in the church. Even if the church is a very slow wagon, we must still put the new knowledge on it, because it is the only possible wagon. That is why we are so inwardly interested in church politics. We must go out to conquer the church. It is the instrument through which we can most surely get at our people!" Many theologians and pastors in the national churches are thus, like Graue, monists, i. s., people who identify God and the world, and deny not merely Christianity, but also the personality of God. Also D. Hunzinger, in his lecture at the "Ecclesiastical Conference at Leipzig," said: "We have even witnessed the spectacle of country church pastors joining the Monist League, and appearing and still appearing as leaders and agitators of it." Nevertheless, the Positives with Hunzinger maintain that it is God's will to hold fast to the Landeskirchen! F. B.

**"Drews has not hitherto** known how to reply, either in the debate or otherwise, to the factual reasons which have been offered in opposition to him. Asked to do so in Jena, he said he would answer as he pleased. All he does when cornered with proofs is to declare them spurious, after they had just been calmly treated by him in his lecture as genuine, but misinterpreted. Whether such conduct and Mr. Drews's letter to the newspapers can really still be excused by dilettantism, or whether all this must be credited to a professor in quite a different way, I leave to the judgment of the public to decide." Thus complains the liberal Weinel at Jena. But in the same way the liberals do it, when the positive places to them

from the Gospels hold forth of JEsu's deity, virgin birth, etc.: they simply declare them spurious.
F. B.

According to the "E. K. Z.", Fr. Schrenk expressed the following thoughts in a lecture **at the Gnadau Community Conference**: "In the face of all movements that want to represent a new Pentecost, it must first be stated: Children of God do not wait for Pentecost. Pentecost for us is the Jerusalemite outpouring of the Spirit Apost. 2, which is followed as the most significant milestone by the first giving of the Spirit to Gentiles, Apost. 10. Since that time it remains firm: everyone who believes in Jesus Christ and lives in Him has the Holy Spirit, and through the Holy Spirit we, the believers, are in Christ. For this we need not wait for Pentecost. The presence of the Holy Spirit is witnessed to us by spiritual gifts, but we do not have these in apostolic abundance. Of the causes of this lack of the Spirit it is then said, "The cause cannot be in God; it is in us. We must not ask God for Pentecostal gifts--that would be a convenient way--but we must set about sincerely and stooping to remove the hindrances which do not permit God to bless us and give us Spirit-empowered personalities. The first cause is our carnal nature, which does not walk in real clear divorce from all sin and in complete surrender before God. The second hindrance is the immaturity of the churches and of the children of God, who uncritically run after every new 'doctrine' that emerges (such as the doctrine of the 'bride church' within the church of Christ), and allow themselves to be sung by slogans and sensationalism, instead of being biblically grounded in the grace of Christ. The third cause is the related doctrinal confusion. On the one hand, the liberal theology threatens to destroy the foundations of our faith; on the other hand, all kinds of English doctrines (especially the doctrine of the pure heart) are accepted, which obscure the teachings of our Reformers. In addition to this, the church of God is increasingly being torn apart, and the so-called 'Pentecostal movement' has unfortunately contributed much to this. We ourselves are to blame for the doctrinal confusion, for we have kept silent in the face of the English graduated doctrine and German doctrinal confusion in false love and out of cowardice, instead of raising protest: We do not want a Pentecost at any price, such as a Pentecost with a lying spirit or with spiritualism, but a Pentecost from the upper sanctuary. Our task is work for sound doctrine. We have a long line of men of God and theologians in the last few centuries with whom we could be truly seen, and whose thorough teaching could give us what we need!" The hoax of Father Paul's speaking in tongues and the Kassel movement seem to have opened the eyes of many of the community people to some extent, but they are not yet completely cured of their enthusiasm.

**In Germany a Congo League was formed to** control the "predatory economy" and the "cruelty" in the Congo. The proclamation of accession states: "The League has set itself the task of enlightening the widest circles of Germany about the Congo question by means of a wholehearted, strictly truthful description of the conditions in the Congo, and of creating guarantees that the measures already taken and still to be taken for the moral and material welfare of the natives will actually be implemented.

Furthermore, to work towards the abolition of the trade monopoly and the restoration of the freedom of trade established by the Congo Act, and also to grant the natives the right of disposal over the natural products of their land and soil, and finally, that German professional consuls be sent in sufficient numbers to the Belgian Congo with the instruction to watch over the observance of the Congo Act in every direction, and that a new conference of the signatory powers of the Berlin Congo Act be brought about." In Rome, Belgium, and America, Leopold II. has been hailed by the mendacious Roman hierarchy as the model of a humane regent. But what tyrants would not have taken the Roman history-mongers to their defence so long as they were only, like Leopold, good papal servants? F. B.

**Zionism**. The "E. K. Z." writes: "The ninth Zionist Congress, the first to meet on German soil (in Hamburg), caused the antagonisms between Eastern European (Russian and Austrian) and Western Jewry to burst sharply upon each other. The Eastern Zionists were harshly critical of the leadership, which emphatically stressed that one could not depart from the Basel program of Zionism: 'to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured under public law', while those with regard to the new Young Turk government demanded a change in this programme and impatiently urged mass immigration into Palestine. The contradictions have not been eliminated by the Congress, and the prestige of the leadership has been weakened. The whole Zionist movement has certainly suffered severe losses in that the innovations in Turkey, so joyfully welcomed at first, have proved a serious obstacle to its aspirations. Incidentally, Max Nordau's speech, which emphasized the Zionist ideal with emphasis, was rewarded: 'We want to form a nationality in the Ottoman federation like all other nationalities in the empire; if we want to go to Turkey, it is to be Palestinian Jews as Ottoman members of the empire,' drew thunderous applause, a sign that the Basier program still has a strong following. Whether Zionism will ever reach its goal, and whether it will then become a stage on the road to the Christianization of Israel: who is able to say? At any rate, it brings life and movement into the Jewish masses, and through it forces of renewal may be awakened." Whoever adheres to the Scriptures knows that there will be neither a general conversion of the Jews nor a Millennium here on earth, and that therefore also to this delusion of the Chiliastes Zionism with its plans cannot be a preliminary station.

**Only marriages performed by the priest** are true marriages according to Roman doctrine. The "Reformation" reports: On May 8, 1909, a Catholic daughter of Therwil (Switzerland) had herself married to a Protestant after the civil marriage according to the Protestant rite. On this occasion the secular daughters' choir of Therwil, of which the Catholic bride had hitherto been a member, had serenaded her. On May 23, the Catholic priest Meury in Therwil stated in his Christian teaching that marriage was a sacrament, and as such must be entered into according to the rules of the Catholic Church, and that consequently any marriage that did not meet these requirements was not a true marriage before God and the Catholic Church, but a sinful, immoral cohabitation. The priest

then further criticized the conduct of the daughters' choir for glorifying such a marriage and "still going to sing to such a one." He therefore forbade Catholic daughters under the age of eighteen to join this choir. On the basis of these remarks, the couple in question filed an action of injuria against the priest, and Father Meury was punished by both the District Court and the Cantonal Court for insult with a fine of 50 francs. Rev. Meury appealed against this sentence to the Federal Court in a constitutional appeal. He claimed that he had merely explained a dogma of the Catholic Church in connection with a concrete incident and that he thus enjoyed the protection of the freedom of faith and worship guaranteed in Articles 49 and 50 of the Federal Constitution. This right of freedom was violated by the criminal sentence, and the latter therefore had to be set aside. The minority of the Constitutional Law Division of the Federal Supreme Court wanted to confirm the sentence, since the priest had indeed insulted the couple and had scolded their marriage an immoral cohabitation. However, it was even more a strong attack on the civil marriage, which is considered sufficient by the civil law system, and it was not acceptable to direct such an accusation against a person who had satisfied the legal requirements. The majority, however, which included two Catholics, overturned the judgment. Their argument was as follows: the doctrine which the priest had put forward was indeed Catholic Church doctrine, and he had had the right to proclaim the doctrine and also to apply it to a concrete case. Even if the form had been too harsh, the rebuke had nevertheless been pronounced in a closed cultus building in a closed cultus act. - Thus the Pope reviles Protestant marriages as concubinage and immoral cohabitation, and yet many Protestants feel honored when they are granted an audience by the Vatican!

F. B.

**Concerning the Los von Rom movement in Austria,** the "E. K. Z." writes: "Serious Christian circles often do not want to know anything about the whole Los von Rom movement in Austria; it is only of a national, not of a religious nature. Now it has always been admitted that the national need of the Germans of Austria has certainly given the impetus; the real cause, however, lay in the fault of the Roman Church, which has not offered the souls living bread and fresh spring water. We also readily admit that the national undercurrent is still there and serves essentially to further the cause. But do we on that account deny and reject the whole movement? There is also a strong national tone in the Reformation. For his Germans Luther was born, for his Germans he wanted to live. And no less a personage than Father Alban Schachleitner, the General Field Marshal of the anti-Los of Rome movement, declared in May 1905: 'The Los of Rome movement was a national one and has now become for the most part a religious one.' This word has been even more true since then."

**The Mariavites in Russian Poland and Lithuania** now number about 200,000 members. The movement began in 1893 and took a special upswing when the priest Kolawsky joined it in 1900. The bishops first tried to suppress Mariavitism by sending the Mariavite-minded priests to remote rural areas.

the people. When this did not help, a real persecution began, in which the Roman priests incited the population against the Mariavites, resulting in such bloodshed that once 15 dead and 150 wounded remained on the battlefield. They were recognized by the state in 1906. But all churches, parsonages and other church property were denied them by the court, just as our Pope-friendly government did to the priests and congregations who renounced Rome in the Philippines. SPECIAL CASE TO THE **SUMUM JUS SUMMA INJURIA**! Now, however, the Mariavites already have over 100 churches, in the city of LodZ alone three large stone churches. At the Old Catholic Congress in Utrecht their leader was consecrated "Bishop of the Catholic Church of the Mariavites". The main reason for their separation was the immoral conduct of the Roman priests. The Mariavites deny the infallibility of the Pope, elect themselves priests, and use the mother tongue in divine service. In the "Chr. W." Stjehule reports: "The founder of the Mariawitic Church in Poland is Mrs. Feliksa Franziska Maria Kozlowska (born 1862). Between 1893 and 1904 she had visions in which Jesus enlightened her about the moral corruption of the Catholic Church and ordered her to found an association of priests based on the Rule of St. Francis of Assist. This association was entrusted with the renewal of the Church. The means for this was to be the veneration of the Blessed Sacrament and the Virgin Mary. Mrs. Kozlowska succeeded in winning over to her idea a number of the most educated and noble Polish priests, who were concerned about the neglect of the Polish masses. They began a morally and also culturally enlightening work among the people. Persecuted by the Polish bishops and banned by the Pope, these priests and their followers broke away from Rome and founded an independent ecclesiastical community. At the beginning of 1909, there were about 70 parishes with 132,000 organized members. The number of the remaining, not yet organized followers amounts to about 400,000. Literarily the movement works with two magazines, ***Maryawita*** **and** ***Powiadomoschtsi Marjawickie,*** published since 1907 in LodZ. Both magazines are published weekly, the annual over 800 pages. The ***Maryawita*** serves to present the religious views of the community, the ***Powiadomoschtsi*** - in German approximately "news" - to the discussion with the outside world, to the education of the members of the community in general, also public questions and to their common discussion. A perusal of these journals teaches that all the accusations spread against the Mariavites, e.g. superstition and fanaticism, are idle talk or slander. On the contrary, there is an abundance of religious life and Christian activity; the tone is everywhere calm, matter-of-fact, even genteel; there is no trace of excitement and excessive asceticism. The polemics are truly conducted in love - not a crude word dulls the inner joy of this reading." But that up to now the Mariavites have not yet taken down much of the veil which Papism has put around Christ and His teaching, is evident from the position which they assign to the Virgin Mary, of whom they confess: "We believe in the participation of the Mother of God in the work of redemption. We pay homage to her,

not only by asking her to mediate for us with God, but also by striving to realize in our own lives the perfection of her life. Mary is the living reality of the Church of Christ; but she is not herself the Church." In Bohemia, Poland, and other countries of the Counter-Reformation, Mary was made the symbol of anti-Protestantism by the Jesuits, and Marywitism is also a proof of the success with which the Jesuits inculcated Mariolatry in these peoples. About the Roman clergy, the Mariawites judge: "We Mariawitic priests have emerged from the midst of the Catholic priests, and their religious convictions, their faith, and their way of life are well known to us. A relatively short intercourse with them has convinced us that the entirety of the Catholic clergy, their bishops first of all, do not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, in the divine power of the holy sacraments, in life after death. With our own eyes we have seen the most repulsive transgressions of the Catholic priests. . . . At first we thought the evil was merely local, the fault of individuals. But in a short time we have convinced ourselves that the unbelief, the impiety, and the neglect of the clergy are general. We take a different view of the Catholic people. The people are still in bondage to the Catholic hierarchy, so that the words of the Apocalypse refer to them: Come out of her, my people!" F. B.

**A service of high churchmanship** is thus described in "Travel Impressions from England" in the "Chr. W.": "On entering the church I am greeted by the fragrance of incense. I take my seat and look around until the service begins. The church is modern. It is sharply separated from the nave by a gothic wooden balustrade; the high choir with red burning lights, the "eternal light", with a rich high altar and many candles, which are lit by an usher for the high **celebration** (as the service is announced outside at the entrance); there are confessionals on the walls of the side aisles. Slowly the church fills up. Before kneeling in their places on the prayer stools, they all bow towards the altar and bend the knee. With the tolling of the bells the choir fills up; the singers, men and boys, enter from the front, and through a back door the three officiating priests in magnificent chasubles, accompanied by choirboys and choir servants. The high mass begins. From a distance the congregation sees the priests walking back and forth at the altar, swinging the thurible, kneeling, crossing themselves, carrying the book from one side of the altar to the other, kissing it and lifting it up; they can be heard murmuring and singing incomprehensible words, interrupted by the sustained Gregorian chant - and kneeling, from time to time answering and striking the cross, the congregation remains in devotion. The sermon, read word for word from the pulpit by a priest, forms only a small part of the whole service; it is followed by the solemn Eucharist, without congregational communion, with elevation and enjoyment of the priests. On leaving the church I take with me a pamphlet which is on display, and which explains in a popular way the practice and doctrine of the High Churchmanship. And there I read: 'Are we then a part of the Catholic Church? Yes, indeed! Yes, isn't the Church of England in the time of the Reformation

become another? Not at all! A man who has had influenza and has recovered is still the same. Why do We bow before the altar? We bow thereby before the throne of God, and above all before the sacrament which is on the altar, and in which Christ Himself is present.'"

**Death penalty for the "heretics".** Lucă, professor at the Pontifical University in Rome, in his "Textbook of Public Canon Law" of 1901, stated: "Where circumstances permit, heretics are still to be punished by death today. Heretics may be delivered to death by the Church without hesitation, for they may be excommunicated, which is an even greater punishment. Capital punishment is also to be used against them, lest the wicked harm the good. Finally, capital punishment is sometimes a benefit to criminals" (meaning "heretics") "themselves, since, if they lived longer, their unbending obstinacy would make them worse, and therefore they would have only more violent torments to endure in hell." Brors gives similar proofs of noble broad-mindedness and Christian charity in 1902 in the "Modern ABC for Catholics of All Estates" when he asserts under No. 122: "A heretic is a person who knowingly and against his conscience falls away from the true faith. This is certainly a great sin, for which, according to Holy Scripture, he deserves the eternal punishment of hell; therefore, a heretic also deserves earthly death." Likewise, Lépicier, professor of dogmatics at the Propaganda, consultor of the Congregation of the Sacraments, the Congregation of Propaganda, the Congregation of Studies, member of the Papal Biblical Commission and of the Commission appointed by the present Pope to work on canon law, that is, member of the most important Roman ecclesiastical authorities and, moreover, the Pope's confidant!

**Dissertation in the year 3000:** "Did Goethe live? We will have to examine the question rigorously and critically. A surprising new light falls on this problem when we look at the work 'Faust', which is regarded as Goethe's most secure property. In a passage that is immune to the suspicion of subsequent insertion, it says: 'What immeasurable horror grips you supermen.' Now, without doubt, the word 'Übermensch' is the characteristic word of Nietzsche's philosophy. But Nietzsche undoubtedly lived from 1884 to 1900, while Goethe is said to have died in 1832! This glaring contradiction is now resolved in the way that Goethe - who, according to tradition, appears sometimes as a naturalist, sometimes as a poet, sometimes even as a draughtsman - is in truth only a -mythical personality'. The name is simply explained by the Ur-Germanic Gothic stem. A personality named Goethe never lived." (Das Reich.)

**What the educated world admires.** The following theatre review was published in the "Dresdener Anzeiger": "Zentraltheater. The Luxury Train. Our verdict fei short, concise and unambiguous: one cannot easily see anything more disgusting than the Luxuszug, which is now being played by the Neue Wiener Bühne at the Zentraltheater. A basic soup is scooped up from the muddy dregs of the cesspool, served up in what appears to be a shiny social sphere. Over a snow-white tablecloth pours a foul-smelling mixture of disgusting broth: there one has the impression of the play. Circumstances and persons are paraded, so spiritless, so hopeful-

that the abyss of stupidity opens up before one. The cynicism is joined by a plumpness that is probably the most unsympathetic. The author is not content to say something mean, he says it as obtrusively as possible, broadly, with a confidential nudge of the rib and a sly wink. The second act, which is still the most bearable, if you like, is followed by a third, an act of the most ungraceful meanness. The fourth I could endure no longer. I expressly state that the play had strong applause after the second act, and stormy applause after the third. This does not alter my judgment: One cannot easily see anything more disgusting, plumper, and unsympathetic than this play. F. Kummer."

A broad current in contemporary pedagogy is currently directed **against the "dull" memorization in religious education. In** contrast, the words of Th. Traub deserve attention: "We consider it our duty to transfer our other knowledge to the child, why should we not do the same with our religious knowledge and insights? Boredom in this is an evil thing. Luther urged us to take care that "souls are not extinguished by boredom. We join Jung Stilling and Salzmann in urgently warning that children should not be made to read the Bible. We warn with Jung Stilling and Salzmann against making Bible reading a hard yoke for the children, and admonish with the pious Goßner: 'Do not make your children bitter by forcing them to become blessed? But we must not spare them the memorization of good sayings and songs. They should take a properly measured treasure of core sayings and core songs with them on their way. To be sure, they may not fully understand some of what they have to learn for the time being. There is no harm in that. The words have a seed nature; they lie dormant for a while and burst forth in their own time. The historian Treitschke once dismissed the too far-reaching attacks against the 'dull' memorizing of songs and sayings, saying: 'This worldly conceit of knowledge quite forgot that religious truths are also only guessed at by man and are only really comprehended when he has learned them in himself; Similarly, that the sublime sayings of biblical wisdom, once absorbed into the receptive memory, live on with man in silence, and then suddenly, in the temptations and misfortunes of life, show a consoling and uplifting crast which is inherent neither in the multiplication table, nor in the Abc, nor in the children's fables of the ox and the ass? Herder, whom no one can accuse of muckraking, held in favor of it: 'The catechism must be learned quite intimately by heart and remain forever. Explanations about him are a treasure of duties and knowledge of men? Even Pestalozzi writes in his report to the public of 1820: 'To get to know the biblical history and especially the life, suffering and death of Jesus Christ exactly and then to practise the most sublime passages of the bible in a childlike believing sense, I think is the beginning and the essence of what is necessary with regard to religious education, and then especially a fatherly care to make the children deeply feel the value of prayer in faith? The national economist Röscher says: 'The men who want to limit so much the memorizing of Bible verses in school must not have experienced what inexpressible and inexhaustible refreshment such memory treasures can grant in sorrowful nights? " (G. d. G.)

**Of the power of the Brahmins in India,** an English newspaper writes: "The influence and power of the Brahmins is almost incalculable. For nearly three millennia the Brahmin caste, though by no means the most numerous, has exercised intellectual and religious dominion over all the other castes and classes of India. In the Mohammedan era the Brahmin was generally the guiding spirit of temporal politics, and it is said that in the present day it is not the Englishman who in reality rules India, but the Brahmin Sheristatar (tax-collector) and the great host of Brahmin officials. It is the Brahman Pandit alone who knows and interprets the Shastras which govern the social and religious life of the Hindus. His word is the law for more than 200 million of their fellow citizens. It is the Brahmin priest who officiates at the domestic ceremonies of every household. It is the Brahmin who, by the power of the superiority of his intellect, forces his way to the highest offices of government. It is the Brahmin who administers the law almost in every village and town. It is the Brahmin who procures for himself, among the English engineers, the chief share in the public works, and who in reality imparts the benefits of irrigation to the peasants. On the railways, the canals, in the hospitals, in the Government and Hindu schools, it is the Brahmin who exercises the controlling influence. everywhere it is the Brahmin who represents the Government to the people. He is the medium between the British officials and the villager. To a certain extent his position is courted by others today; it is the native Christians, in particular, who rival him, not without success; but his intellectual supremacy still prevails everywhere. Even Western civilization, though it has introduced democratic ideas and enabled other classes to acquire the benefits of education, has increased the power of the Brahmin; for he has not only shown great adaptability to foreign ideas, nay, a willingness to appropriate them, but he also knows masterfully how to make use of them. It is therefore an imperative necessity that we should not relax our efforts to win the Brahmins and other higher castes to Christianity by every means in our power."

**Rousseau,** in the "Creed of the Savoyard Vicar," says: "Will we say that the history of the Gospel is an idle invention? My friend, one does not invent in this way; and the deeds of Socrates, in which no one doubts, are less authenticated than those of Christ. At bottom, this is only pushing back the difficulties without removing them; it would be more incomprehensible that several men should have made this book in agreement than that one should have supplied the contents. Never would Jewish authors have found this tone, this moral, and the Gospel possesses such great, such striking, such utterly inimitable features of truth, that the inventor of it ought to be more marveled at than the hero." If there were no men, no animals, no flowers, there would be no pictures of these objects: much less would the Gospels be possible if the JEsus of the Gospels were not real. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. October 1910. No. 10.**

## Illuminating the Norwegian Unification Thesis.

The "Norwegian Synod," which from the beginning was connected with the Missouri Synod and Synodical Conference, whose representatives at the intersynodical conferences of the last decade, in the disputed doctrines concerning the analogy of faith, The Synodal Conference has for some years been engaged in negotiations with the two other Norwegian church bodies in this country, the United Church and the Hauges Synod, which do not share the doctrinal position of the Synodal Conference. The purpose of these negotiations was and is to possibly eliminate the existing doctrinal differences and thus bring about, if not a synodal, then at least an ecclesiastical union of the three Norwegian synods of America. The representatives of these synods first discussed the doctrine of calling and conversion, and, with the exception of D. Schmidt, agreed upon a double set of propositions, which were then published in the 1908 main number of the "Kirketidende," and referred to and reviewed by other church papers. By the Ohioans and Iowaans they were favorably reviewed, but by the Wisconsin "Quarterly" they were objected to on various grounds. "Doctrine and Wisdom," in its February, 1909, number, commented briefly that the sentences referred to did not contain a confessional, clear, unambiguous exposition of the doctrine of conversion, precisely in the face of the error that surrounds us. It was hoped that the thesis writers themselves would retract or correct their theses. But this expectation was not fulfilled. Nor has the addition of antitheses, in which the errors prevailing at the present time were to be repudiated, as promised by our Norwegian brethren, taken place to date. On the contrary, in the 1910 main edition of "Kirketidende" those sentences about "calling" and "conversion" are endorsed anew and presented as proof of this.

that all members of the Unification Committee - with the exception of D. Schmidt - had thus renounced all and every synergism. At the same time, ten new theses by D. Stub on the election of grace, on which the committee has already acted several times without reaching agreement, are printed in the aforementioned church bulletin. This year's district synods of the "Norwegian Synod" have declared themselves in favor of continuing the committee negotiations. Thus the Norwegian Unification Theses are still before the eyes of the Lutheran Church in this country, and such public testimony on important doctrinal matters also requires public illumination. It is not an act of unbrotherliness to warn others against going astray. And, as just noted, when something erroneous or misleading is made public and passes through the church daily press, public rebuke is also in order.

Theses on vocation and conversion.

on the appeal.

1. The natural man is in a state of spiritual sleep and spiritual death.

Eph. 5, 14: Therefore saith he, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall enlighten thee.

Eph. 2, 1: And also unto you, being dead in trespasses and sins.

2. In order that such a spiritually sleeping and spiritually dead person might be converted and saved, God calls him through his gospel.

2 Thess. 2, 14: Whereunto he hath called you through our gospel unto the glorious possession of our Lord JEsu Christ.

Joh. 6, 44: No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day.

3. When God calls men, he stirs their hearts by his word; that is, men who are called cannot avoid hearing in their hearts the work of calling itself, by law and gospel; that is, certain unavoidable thoughts and movements.

Hebr. 4, 12: For the word of God is living and powerful etc.

Jer. 23, 29: Is not my word like a fire etc.?

Joh. 6, 60: Many of His disciples who heard this said: This is a hard saying etc.

Mark. 10, 22: But he was displeased because of the speech etc.

4. Through his calling, God reveals his grace to the called one, that is, he instructs the called one that grace is to be obtained for sinners.

Mark. 16, 15: And said unto them: Go ye into all the world, etc.

Apost. 9, 15: The Lord said to him, "Go, for this man is my chosen armor.

Rom. 10, 18: But I say, Have they not heard? etc.

Is. 45, 22: Turn to me and you will be saved etc.

Is. 1, 18: Come then and let us be right with one another etc.

5. By his calling, God offers his grace to the one called, and this offering is meant equally earnestly toward all who are called, that is,

God offers his grace to all who are called with the earnest intention that he will give it and that the called should accept it.

1 Tim. 2, 4: Who desires all men to be helped, etc.

Is. 55, 6. 7: Seek the LORD, because he is to be found etc.

Ezek. 33, 11: So say to them, As I live, etc.

6. When God calls through His Word, He thereby gives power to accept grace.

a. Man has by nature or of himself no strength, power, or prowess to accept the grace offered, or to work anything to his conversion.

1 Cor. 2, 14: The natural man etc.

Eph. 2, 1: And also unto you, etc.

2 Cor. 3, 5: Not that we are able of ourselves etc.

Phil. 2, 13: For it is God who works in you etc.

Eph. 2, 8-10: For by grace you have been saved etc.

See also Rom. 7, where the apostle describes the natural man and his powerlessness for good.

b. Before the rebirth man also does not receive any inherent power, which he now would possess as his own and with which he now could determine himself for grace.

Joh. 8, 36: If the Son therefore shall make you free etc.

Joh. 1, 12: How many received Him etc.

c. But God's call is an effectual call, working powerfully on the heart of the called, so that the called also, in virtue of the grace offered, under the drawing of the Spirit of God, and on account of the power now working on him by the call, has a full occasion and real possibility of being converted, or of being converted, of repenting of his sin, and of believing on Christ. And this inducement and possibility is equally great to all who are called, whether they answer the call or not.

Revelation 3:20: Behold, I stand at the door and knock, etc.

Joh. 6, 44: No one can come to me, unless the Father draws him etc.

Luk. 13, 6-9: But he told them this parable: One had a fig tree, etc.

Matth. 21, 32: John came to you and taught you the right way and you did not believe him etc.

Matth. 12, 41. 42: The people of Nineveh will appear etc.

Is. 5, 1-4: Well, I will catch my beloved a song of my cousin from his vineyard etc.

Jer. 26, 2. 3: Thus saith the LORD, Enter into the court . . . if they will hear and be converted.

Jer. 36, 5-7: And Jeremiah commanded Baruch, saying, ... whether they would humble themselves with prayer before the LORD, and turn every man from his evil way, etc.

## Conversion.

1. In his natural state, man has fallen away from God, is a stranger to Him and His grace, indeed downright hostile to Him.

1 Cor. 2, 14: But the natural man hears nothing etc.

Eph. 2, 12: That ye should be without Christ, strangers, etc., at that time.

Rom. 8, 7: For to be carnally minded is enmity etc.

Col. 1, 21: And you, who were strangers and enemies in former times, etc.

2. In his natural state, man is also quite spiritually impotent, dead in sins.

Eph. 2, 1: And also unto you that were dead, etc.

Eph. 5, 14: Therefore saith he, Watch out, etc.

Col. 2, 13: And hath also made you alive with him, when ye were dead, etc.

3. No ability or power is found in man to change even this sad state, not even to contribute the least to (any) change.

Joh. 3, 6: That which is born of the flesh etc.

Rom. 8, 7. 8: For to be carnally minded etc.

Matth. 7, 17. 18: So every good tree etc.

Joh. 15, 5: I am the vine etc.

4. The great change that must take place with man who has fallen away from God and is dead in sins is called conversion in Scripture.

2 Tim. 2, 25. 26: And punish the unruly, whether God will give them repentance some day.

Apost. 2, 38: Peter said to them: Repent etc.

Luk. 15, 7: I tell you, there will be joy in heaven over one sinner who repents.

5. To be converted is to turn from darkness to light, from Satan's power to God, and this is done by recognizing and repenting of one's sin and believing in Jesus. Conversion therefore involves two things: 1. repentance and contrition of sin, and 2. faith in the Lord Jesus.

Apost. 26, 18: To open their eyes, that they turn from darkness to light etc.

Apost. 17, 30: And indeed God overlooked the time of ignorance; but now he giveth all men in all places to repent.

Luk. 24, 46. 47: And he said unto them: Thus it is written, and thus Christ must suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day, and preach repentance and remission of sins in his name among all nations, etc.

Mark. 1, 15: And said, The time is fulfilled, etc.

Jer. 3:12-14: . . . Return, you apostate Israel etc. .

Isa. 55, 7: The wicked turneth from his way, etc.

Luk. 15, 21: And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned, etc.

Apost. 2, 37. 38: But when they heard this, it went through their hearts etc.

See also Luk. 7, 36-50 of the sinner at JEsu feet and Apost. 16, 27-34 of the jailer in Philippi.

6. In order that a man may come to the knowledge of his sinful condition and to sorrow and repentance of it, God uses his law, which works through his referral and judgment of mind, will, and conscience; and this law man must hear and consider.

Rom. 3, 20: Therefore that no flesh . ... because by the law comes knowledge of sin.

Rom. 7, 7: What shall we say then? ... But the sin I knew not, etc.

2 Cor. 7, 10: For the godly sorrow worketh, etc.

Mark. 4, 23. 24: He who has ears to hear etc.

Ezek. 1, 10: Hear the word of the LORD, O princes of Sodom, etc.

Luk. 16, 29: Abraham said unto him, They have Moses, etc.

7. If a man has come to the knowledge of sin and judgment by God's work through the law, he is not yet converted; for such a man can still come to either despair or become self-righteous or fall back into the old life of sin, against God's purpose.

Rom. 7, 12: The law is holy etc.

Rom. 4, 15: Because the law only causes wrath.

Rom. 3, 20: Therefore that no flesh by the works of the law, etc., should be able to live.

Apost. 24, 25: But when Paul spoke of righteousness etc..

See also Mark. 10, 17-24 of the rich young man.

8. When the law gets power over a man's heart so that he bows to God's judgment, it works contrition of heart or repentance of sin, and so becomes a disciplinarian from Christ.

Ps. 51, 5. 6: For I know my iniquity, etc.

Gal. 3, 24: So the law has been our disciplinarian upon Christ etc.

9. Solely by God's drawing in the gospel, without compulsion, the man who has come to the knowledge of sin and repentance by the work of the law, is now brought to faith in Christ, and thus wholly converted and changed; "out of a darkened mind becomes an enlightened mind, out of a resisting will becomes an obedient will, and this the Scripture calls creating a new heart. Ps. 51:12, "'Create in me, O God, a pure heart, and give me a new certain spirit!'"

Joh. 6, 44: No one can come to me, unless the Father draws him etc.

Matth. 11, 28: Come to me, all of you etc.

Eph. 2, 8: For by grace etc.

Rom. 1, 16. 17: For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ etc.

Ezek. 36, 26: And I will give you a new heart and a new spirit within you etc.

10. If a man is not converted, man alone bears the responsibility and the guilt, because he did not want to, that is: that in spite of God's making it possible for man by calling to be converted or to be converted, he resists and makes impossible the work of the Holy Spirit both in the law and in the gospel, something that man can do from every point.

Matth. 23, 37: Jerusalem, Jerusalem etc.

Jer. 6, 16: Thus saith the LORD; Tread ye out of the way. . . . But they said: We will not do it.

Hebr. 3, 7-9: Therefore, as the Holy Spirit says, Today, if you will hear, etc.

Is. 5, 4: What more should be done in my vineyard etc.?

11. When a man is converted, the glory belongs to God alone, because he absolutely, from beginning to end, without any cooperation on the part of man, works conversion in the man who is converted, that is, who recognizes his sin and believes in Christ.

Joh. 1, 12. 13: But how many would receive Him etc.?

Phil. 2, 13: For it is God etc.

1 Cor. 4, 7: For who hath preferred thee, etc.?

See also Eph. 2, 1-10 and Rom. 3, 20-28, where the apostle describes the conversion as a work of grace of God, for which the glory belongs to God alone.

D. Schmidt requested to have attached to the minutes that he did not participate in the vote on item 11; D. Schmidt was also not present at the last meeting when items 6, b and c were approved by the appeal.

**Notes on the first series of theses, on "vocation".**

First, a general preliminary remark. "Calling" in the above theses is distinguished throughout from "conversion," and is used only in the sense of offering or presenting salvation, of invitation. In this sense κλητο***ί, έκάλεσεν is found,*** e. g., Matth. 20. 22; Luk. 14. In all the apostolic epistles, however, and so also in the passage quoted, 2 Thess. 2, 14, the expressions **καλεῖν, *κλήσις, κλητοί,*** denote the successful calling; καλεῖν is there as much as **arcessire**, to call, to bring by calling, thus identical with conversion.

Concerning Thesis 3 and 4: In the third thesis, which deals with the calling that only happens through the gospel, the mention of the law is out of place. It remains unclear what these "thoughts and movements" are that are produced by word and calling in the people who are called. There is only a double kind of **motus mentis et voluntatis**, namely, **spirituales,** movements of a spiritual nature, and **carnales**, movements of a carnal nature. **Motus** spirituales arise only in conversion; conversion, after all, is nothing else than God kindling the **primi motus** spirituales in the heart that has died. In the natural, unconverted man, even when the word approaches him, motus **carnales** are only found, such motus as that he becomes indignant and displeased at the word, Joh. 6, 60, Mark. 10, 22, or also that he, as e. g. Herod and Agrippa, feels a natural, useless pleasure in the word. This had to be made clear. The statements that man hears the work of the calling, that God, through his calling, reveals his grace to the called, and instructs him that grace is to be obtained for the sinner, likewise need further explanation. It is certain that when a man hears the call of God in the Gospel, the call to marriage, he also notices and understands something of it, that even the natural, unconverted man, when he hears and reads the Word, recognizes something of the content of the Word, also of the truth of the Gospel. Our confession, indeed, remarks on Act. 7, that those who always resist the Holy Spirit resist the known truth. The Lord testifies of the unbelievers that the Holy Spirit convicts them, naturally through the gospel, that unbelief is the chief sin and leads to destruction, that in Christ alone is salvation and righteousness. Joh. 16, 8-11. But this understanding, this knowledge is and remains natural until the person is converted,

spiritual knowledge, and never now develops into the spiritual knowledge which God gives when he enlightens and converts man, which is closed to the natural man, as then the apostle says, "The natural man heareth nothing of the Spirit of God; it is foolishness unto him, and he cannot know it." 1 Cor. 2:14. And now, as the expressions "hearing," "God hath revealed it unto us," "God hath taught us," are often used in Scripture specifically of the spiritual knowledge which God kindles in conversion, here also a precise distinction had to be made between the natural and the spiritual spheres.

Concerning Thesis 6: Already in the second thesis and then again in the tenth thesis of the second series of theses there is talk of being able to be converted, of the possibility of being converted or of being converted. And these expressions are treated most extensively in the sixth thesis of the first series. It should be noted first of all that these expressions are used in a twofold sense, in the sense of a subjective and an objective possibility. It may justly be said that, after Christ has redeemed sinners, and the Holy Spirit has begun his work on earth, namely, that by the word he earnestly and powerfully calls all who hear it, there is an objective possibility for all who are under the sound of the word to be converted and saved, that now all sinners may be converted and saved by grace, by the word. It is then only the power inherent in grace, in the Word, to convert man that is emphasized. In this sense our Confession uses the word "can," e. g., Müller, Symb. B., p. 594, that man "by God's grace might be converted to good and become free," **homo verti potest ad bonum per gratiam**. And so it is Is. 55:6, "Seek ye the Lord, because he is to be found." The Vulgate has correctly translated, **Quaerite Dominum, dum inveniri potest**. But the expressions "can," "possibility," often denote subjective possibility, an ability, a power, which man can use. And now, when in the third and fourth theses there is talk of a "hearing" wrought by the calling, of the "revealing" of grace, in the fifth thesis there is talk of the "offering" of grace, and then in the sixth thesis it is continued, "When God calls by fine word, he at the same time gives power to accept grace," if one takes these **climax**: Revealing, offering, giving power, in view, and when it is further said under 6a, "that the one called has also in virtue of the grace offered, under the drawing of the Spirit of God, and on the basis of the power which now works on him through the calling, a full cause and real possibility , to be converted, or to be converted, to repent of his sin, and to believe on Christ"-so the nearest thought is, that even before conversion a man receives by calling a power which he can use, the very power of accepting grace, that

The consequence of this is that conversion or non-conversion depends on the use or non-use of this possibility, power, or ability. Thus the newer theologians, who teach that by the calling grace in all men who hear the word the imprisoned will is freed, so that it may decide for or against Christ, the Ohioans and Iowaans, who suppose that by the calling or **gratia praeveniens** a man gets the ability and power to refrain from wilful reluctance, use the same expressions and phrases which are found in the sixth thesis. Compare against this what the Formula of Concord emphasizes in the second article, "that the free will cannot of its own natural powers alone work or cooperate anything to its own conversion, righteousness, and blessedness, nor follow, believe, and give its consent to the Holy Spirit, so beckoning to it God's grace and blessedness through the gospel," § 18; That conversion is "such a change by the operation of the Holy Spirit in man's mind, heart, and will, that by such operation of the Holy Spirit man may accept the grace offered," § 83; That those who are truly born again have an **arbitrium liberatum**, as Christ says, they are again made free, "the cause being, not only to hear the word, but also to applaud and accept the same, though in great weakness," § 67; - That, therefore, man, before his conversion, cannot accept grace, even when it is offered him, when he is "called," that God the Holy Spirit, in the conversion itself, with the accepting, faith, works at the same time the "being able to accept," that only the truly born again can "accept." It is true that under Thesis 6 b the limitation is now introduced: "Before being born again, man also receives no inherent power, which he now possesses as his own, and wherewith he can now determine himself for grace." In this clause, however, the emphasis is evidently on the expression "no indwelling power" which man "possesses as his own," and so by subclause 6b the main clause 6, that God gives power to receive grace by calling, is not subsequently annulled, but is limited to the effect that the power which man receives by calling before regeneration is not yet inwardly inherent in him, has not yet become a possession to him. Just so, as happens in Thesis 6 b, the Ohioans speak of the power which, according to their doctrine, is communicated to man through vocation behuss omission of wilful resistance. In the May 1905 issue of the "Theologische Zeitblätter" we read: "We have never spoken of 'handling spiritual powers' or even of 'spiritual life'; because

This would presuppose that the 'power' of which we speak was already present in man, inherent in him, and had already become his possession. Neumissouri knows very well that we mean nothing else than that God so influences man in the process of conversion, and, if conversion is not to be the effect of an irresistible grace, must so influence him that man can now refrain from the reluctance which he is continually able to bring into use even in the face of the greatest grace. And this ability may well be called a power, not, to be sure, one that has already become a permanent possession, but one that passes from the Holy Spirit through the means of grace to the man in process of conversion." The way in which the sixth thesis operates with "possibility," with "being able to be converted" and "being able to be converted," is at least ambiguous and misleading. Our Norwegians may well have explained to us that in the 6th thesis only the objective power of the Word to convert man was to be described. But then they just had to express themselves differently. Yes, in view of the ohio-iowash doctrinal position and terminology, they had to expressly exclude the thought of a subjective possibility, of a subjective ability, of a power and capacity communicated to man by vocation before conversion. Dear as we are to pure doctrine, earnest as we are to the preservation of pure doctrine, we must, in the exposition of doctrine, carefully and anxiously avoid all ambiguous and misleading speech, in which the opposite party may also place his doctrine, and speak so clearly, definitely, and unambiguously, that no one can be in doubt as to our opinion.

**Notes on the second series of theses, on "the conversion".**

On Thesis 6. On this thesis, which says of the effect of the law, 2 Cor. 7, 10 is quoted. Divine sorrow, which worketh repentance unto salvation, which no man repenteth of, is verily not wrought by the mere preaching of the law. The Formula of Concord, in the 5th Article, **de lege et evangelio, §** 9, says: "That the repentance or horror of the law may not become a despair, the preaching of the gospel must be added to it, that it may be a repentance unto blessedness. 2 Cor. 7." Gerhard finely proves in the **locus de poenitentia,** that only repentance connected with faith is a **vera** and **salutaris** ooutritio, and that only when faith is added to it, does the repentance of despair become the repentance to blessedness meant 2 Cor. 7, 10.

To Thesis 7 and 8. Here it is spoken of "knowledge of sin and judgment" and "contrition of heart, or repentance of sin." In the first clause it is said of the knowledge of sin that it may eventually lead to despair. In the second clause the repentance or ooutritio wrought by the law is be-

It is true that "the law has power over a man's heart, so that he bows down to God's judgment," and so the law becomes a disciplinarian of Christ. In our confession, the repentance which the law works is consistently defined as the knowledge of sin and the terror of conscience, and there both are combined into one. He who has rightly recognized his sin and God's judgment on sin from the law no longer lives in security, boldly and cheerfully, but is terrified because of his sin. Repentance, **contritio,** that is, the knowledge of sin and the terror of sin, naturally implies that man also acknowledges sin as guilt and recognizes the justice of God's judgment, and feels and realizes that with his sin he has deserved punishment, wrath, hell. But this is not a willing acknowledgment, but one compelled by the law, hence no better stirring in the heart of man, no hearty assent to the law. It is only when men "believe and have received the Holy Ghost that they begin to hold to the law." Apology XII, 175. The repentance wrought by the law is, as our Confession, Luther, and the other orthodox ancient teachers emphasize, **timor servilis,** not **timor filialis**. Chemnitz, in his "Examen," contests with all his energy the scholastic definition of repentance as a **dolor, timor, terror voluntarie susceptus**. What is to be said about the repentance wrought by the law is briefly and aptly summarized by Luther in the Schmalkaldic Articles in the following sentence: "But the most noble office or power of the law is that it reveals original sin with its fruits and all, and shows man how deeply his nature has fallen and is corrupt without cause, when the law must tell him that he neither has nor respects any God, and worships strange gods, which he would not have believed before and without the law. Thus (this is the inevitable effect of the right knowledge of sin) he is terrified, humbled, despondent, despairing, desiring to be helped, and not knowing where from, begins to be hostile to God, and to grumble, etc. This then is Rom. 4: The law provokes wrath. And Rom. 5: Sin is increased by the law." Müller, Symb. B. P. 312. A scriptural and confessional description of repentance must, especially in view of the modern opposition, which sees in law-keeping a willing, heartfelt humiliation before God and already the beginning of correction, comprehend this twofold moment, that the law, in humiliating man, breaks him down, crushes him, that the very **contritio, when the** gospel is not added to it, necessarily drives to despair, and that man, when he is crushed and broken by the law, nevertheless continues and all the more begins to become an enemy to God, and to murmur that he would there were no law, that there were no God. And it is because of this effect of the law, in that it brings man down...

If a man's heart beats, despairs, and despairs, the law, according to God's purpose and in God's hand, is a disciplinarian of Christ. It is only in a bruised heart, despairing of itself, that the faith and comfort of the gospel clings. Johann Gerhard says: **Lex verberibus suis compellit ad Christum**.

As we look back once again on the double series of theses, we also miss some things that should not have been missing. And in particular a triple.

1. There is no reference in the Theses to such passages in the Confession as speak of how the natural man, having come under the sound of the Word and thus being "called," places himself to the Word before conversion and until conversion. We recall the following remarks of the 2nd Article of the Formula of Concord. § 20: "As Doctor Luther speaks in the 91st Psalm . . . . But in spiritual and divine things, concerning the salvation of souls, man is like a pillar of salt, like Lot's wife, even like a block and stone, like a dead image that needs neither eyes nor mouth, neither mind nor heart . . all teaching and preaching is lost with him before he is enlightened, converted, and born again by the Holy Spirit." § 18: "That the free will, by its own natural powers, not only cannot work or cooperate anything to its own conversion, righteousness, and salvation, nor follow, believe, or give its consent to the Holy Spirit, who beckons to it grace and salvation through the gospel of God, but of an innately evil and **contumacious** nature is hostile to God and his word, where he is not enlightened and governed by God's Spirit," **pro insita sua et contumaci natura Deo et voluntati ejus hostiliter repugnare, nisi Spiritu Dei illuminetur atque regatur**. Previously, in the same paragraph, it is said, "rather, before the new birth, it (the natural carnal will) will be contrary and hostile to God's law and will." § 5: "That the natural man, through the fall of our first parents, is thus corrupted, that in divine matters, concerning our conversion and salvation, he is by nature blind, when God's word is preached, does not understand it, nor could understand it, but considers it foolishness, and even from himself does not draw near to God, but is and remains an enemy of God, until he is converted, believes, is born again, and is renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit through the word preached and heard, out of pure grace, without all his doing." § 24: "For though he (man) may rule the outward members, and hear the gospel, and to some extent consider it, and even speak of it, as is seen in the Pharisees and hypocrites: yet he thinketh it folly, and cannot believe it, thinketh himself worse than a block, that he is contrary and hostile to God's will, unless the Holy Ghost be strong in him, and bring forth faith and other godly virtues and

Obedience kindles and works in him." Such sayings run through the whole of the 2nd Article. Our Confession testifies with all earnestness, and never tires of repeating it, that even when the Holy Spirit offers him grace and blessedness through the Gospel, man still resists **contumaciter et** hostiliter, wilfully and hostilely, altogether, **totus, prorsus** (§ 83. 85), until he is converted, and God in conversion takes away this very resisting and transforms it into obedience. When the doctrinal controversy about the election of grace passed over into a controversy about conversion, these very confessional passages have been emphasized and extensively utilized in the relevant articles of this journal. Especially in the present state of the controversy, they are a necessary part of a correct, unmistakable, and confessional presentation of the doctrine of free will and conversion. The confessional statements recorded, the scriptural statements of the substance, that Christ crucified, the preaching of Him crucified, is foolishness, vexation to the natural man, that conversion begins in the midst of spiritual death and reluctance, place the sin-depravity of man all the more in the light, and thus place the grace of God, which makes willing ones out of unwilling ones, into the full light, and strengthen our confidence in grace, that we trust it to retain the victory in the end over the evil, recalcitrant flesh which we still carry about us and which still troubles us so much. Both knowledge, the knowledge of sin and the knowledge of grace, are weakened when the truth in question takes a back seat.

2. We miss in the theses any touching of that opposition which for decades has kept the doctrine of conversion in flux among us. The Ohioans and Iowaans, as is well known, make an essential distinction between "natural reluctance" and "wilful reluctance," that is, the inward reluctance against the grace of conversion, which is supposed to render conversion impossible, and teach, that through the **gratia praeveniens** or "calling" man is given the power and ability to refrain from willful reluctance, and that then the right use of this power, the factual refraining from willful reluctance, this very conduct of man, infallibly brings about conversion. In this day and age it is a part of confessing the truth that one expressly excludes and rejects the aforesaid counter-doctrine.

3. We miss in the theses every reference to the mystery in conversion, of which the apostle speaks e.g. Rom. 9 and 11. And this last **desiderium** is not the least. Since the days of Melanchthon the **causa discriminis in homine** has been the shibboleth of the Synergists, and the mystery of the **discretio personarum** a

standing emblem of the old Lutheran orthodoxy. Only if we keep this in mind and keep it constantly in our minds that we absolutely cannot understand and explain why, to use our own confession, of two men who are equally guilty and therefore behave in the same evil way, one is given up in a hardened mind and the other is converted, why God gave repentance to Peter and not to Judas, do we remain on the right track and are not tempted to fabricate any behavior, action, or omission on the part of man in order to make this difference somewhat plausible. If, on the other hand, we lose sight of this piece of divine truth, the thought will involuntarily intrude itself into the contemplation of conversion, and will then involuntarily influence the representation that the one who is converted does behave a little better, or has behaved better before, for instance, has made better use of an ability and opportunity presented to him by God, than the other who is not converted.

**Theses on the election of grace.**

1. The doctrine of election by grace belongs to the most difficult doctrines in Scripture, to the "hard food"; it is not a main doctrine in God's Word; because a person can be a believing Christian and be saved, even if he has not come to the knowledge and appropriation of it, if he only holds on to what Scripture says about sin and grace. 1 Cor. 3:2; Heb. 5:12-14; 2 Pet. 3:15, 16.

2. The Scriptures teach an eternal election or predestination to blessedness, but not an election or predestination to damnation. Matth. 20, 16; 22, 14; Apost. 13, 48; Rom. 8, 28-30; 1 Cor. 1, 26-29; Eph. 1, 3-5; 2 Thess. 2, 13; 1 Pet. 1, 1. 2; Jas. 2, 5. (Also ch. 9, 10 and 11 of the Epistle to the Romans may be added).

3. The Holy Scripture teaches that those who will be saved are the elect, and that only the elect will be saved. Matth. 24, 22. 24. 31; 20, 16; 22, 14.

4. Scripture teaches that the cause of election is God's mercy and Christ's merit, nothing in us. Eph. 1, 4. 5; Tit. 3, 4-7; Eph. 2, 4-10.

5. The Scriptures teach that only those who continue in faith to the end are chosen and saved. But although faith that endures, like everything else, is foreknown by God, yet because it is wholly God's gift and work, it cannot be regarded as something that would have moved God on our part to make the decree of election by grace. Rev. 2, 10; Matt. 10, 22; Apost. 15, 18; Eph. 2, 8-10.

6. According to the same rule, according to which God makes men blessed in time, according to the same rule he has determined to make them blessed. Jam. 1, 17. 18.

7. According to God's Word, there is no contradiction between God's general will of grace and eternal election, even if we cannot make this clear to our minds. Therefore also the election of grace must

not to be detached from the common grace in which it is grounded, as if to say that it were contrary to it. It is one and the same powerful will of grace by which the elect are converted and saved, and against which those who perish are hardened. Eph. 1, 3 ff.; Matth. 22, 1 ff.; Rom. 8, 28-30.

8. The Scriptures simply stand by the following: If a man is not chosen or does not become blessed, the cause must not be sought in any predestination of God or in any lack of His call of grace, but only in man's resistance to the end against this earnest of God's grace; if a man is chosen and becomes blessed, this is only to be attributed to the free grace of God in Christ. Hos. 13, 9; Matth. 23, 37; Rom. 11, 33-36; Eph. 2, 4 ff.

9. Election is not to be searched in God's secret counsel, but in his word, in which it has been revealed. But the word of God leads us to Christ, who is the book of life, in which all who are written and chosen shall be saved, as it is written, "He chose us in him before the foundation of the world. (Eph. 1, 4). Formula of Concord, **Epit.** xi, 6. 7.

10. According to the definition of the Formula of Concord of the election of grace based on Rom. 8, 28-30; Eph. 1, 3 ff.; Matth. 22, 1 ff. The election of grace is not merely the act of God in deciding to bring to heaven those who continue in the faith, but it is the act of God's gracious and merciful will in considering from eternity, for Christ's sake, each and every one of those who will be saved, And hath determined, by conversion to Christ, and by preservation in the faith of him, in other words, by the general order of beatitude, which is for all, and by which he is equally earnest to lead all men to save them that shall be saved.

The dogmatists of the seventeenth century use the other doctrinal form of election by grace, which limits election to the act of God in ordaining to eternal life all those whom he foresaw would continue in the faith to the end.

But there can still be unanimity of faith, if this is understood as it is developed by Johann Gerhard in the following words: "Christ's merit is the cause of our election, but since Christ's merit is of no use without faith, therefore we say that the consideration of faith is an element of the decision of the election of grace. With a loud voice we confess that we teach that God had no soundness in men who were to be chosen to eternal life, that he had no regard either to good works or to the use of free will, yea, what is more, not even from faith itself in such a way as to have been determined by it, or on that account to have chosen any one, but we say that it is Christ's merit alone, the value of which God has taken into account, and that it is by pure grace that he has made the decision of election. But because Christ's merit only becomes sound in a man by faith, therefore we say that the election of grace took place in consideration of Christ's merit, which was to be taken by faith. We say, therefore, that all those and only those of

God has eternally chosen them to salvation, of whom he foresaw that by means of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, through the ministry of the gospel, they would come to believe in truth in the Saviour Christ, and to continue in the faith until the end". (**Loc. de electione, §** 161.)

**Notes on the Theses on the Election of Grace.**

In the first, introductory thesis it should have been stated to what extent the doctrine of election by grace is "hard food", namely, insofar as it runs into mysteries that are too high for us, that we cannot and should not investigate, especially the mystery of the **discretio personarum**. These mysteries are referred to in Rom. 9-11. The **sedes doctrinae,** from which we draw the revealed doctrine of the election of grace, as Rom. 8; Eph. 1; 2 Thess. 2, etc., are among the sunny clear passages of Scripture, which every Christian can understand. The best that can be said about the relation of the doctrine of election by grace to other doctrines is the well-known passage in Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans: "But thou followest this epistle in its order, first contending with Christ and the gospel, that thou mayest know thy sin and his grace, afterward contending with sin, as here the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th chapters have taught. After that, when thou art come into the eighth, under the cross and suffering, the verse in the 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters shall teach thee aright, how comforting it is." Yea, as surely as we must first lay the foundation with the doctrine of Christ, of sin, and of grace, before we speak of the election of grace, so surely is the doctrine of the election of grace highly consolatory. How abundantly is the consolation of the election of grace brought out in our confession! This consolation must not be withheld from Christians. And that even the simplest Christian, when he confesses from the heart, "I believe an eternal life. Amen." "I believe . . . that he will give me, together with all believers in Christ, eternal life"-the comfort of God's eternal election implicite grasps and holds fast, Walther has beautifully expounded in one of his treatises on the election of grace. These thoughts must not be omitted in a thesis which speaks out on the meaning of this doctrine.

In the following theses we encounter many unfamiliar expressions and idioms, which we do not wish to discuss here in detail. We will only note the following. The points which we, for our part, in the doctrinal controversy about the election of grace, have brought out from Scripture and confession, that God, in his eternal purpose, that is, in the counsel of the election of grace, decreed the conversion, justification, and blessedness of every Christian, and counseled how he would bring me to it and keep me in it, that this purpose of God cannot fail and cannot be overthrown, that the eternal election of God, and indeed the election in the proper sense of the word, "which alone is over the children of God," is the only one which can be overthrown.

The above theses do not give a clear and unambiguous expression to these characteristic features of the right doctrine of the election of grace, which is in accordance with Scripture and the confession. And it is precisely in confessional theses that clear, unambiguous language is absolutely necessary. As far as the contrast is concerned, the thought runs through the above theses that the doctrine of Scripture and of the confession of the election by grace, to which the authors of the theses also lay claim, and the "doctrinal form" of the dogmatists of the seventeenth century, "who limit the election to that act of God, that he has ordained to eternal life all those of whom he has foreseen that they will remain constant in faith until the end," do not coincide. But the theses writers, especially in view of the present antagonism, had to speak out openly and declare to the Schmidtians with whom they have to do that every old and new theory which conceptually puts faith before election is contrary to Scripture and the Confession. "Election to faith" and "election in respect of faith" are mutually exclusive. If the former is according to Scripture and the Confession, the latter is contrary to Scripture and the Confession.

But the most alarming thing about this series of theses on the election of grace is what is noted at the end of the tenth thesis: "But there can still be unanimity of faith if this" - namely, the so-called second doctrinal trope - "is understood as it is developed by Johann Gerhard in the following words." Hereby the authors of the thesis offered peace to the two other Norwegian synods over the difference of the election of grace. So it is also said towards the close of the article of the "Kirketidende" in which the ten theses are contained: "The representatives of the Norwegian Synod thus declare in these sentences that they do not regard the use of the other form of doctrine as separating the church. I believe that by this declaration we have stretched out our hand as far as we could." By this declaration our Norwegians have stretched out their hand too far. We hold that we cannot enter into church fellowship with a church body, such as the "United Church," which may not confess with us, according to the Formula of Concord, that the eternal election of God, that is election in the proper sense of the word, is a cause of our blessedness and of all that belongs to it, thus also of our faith, but rather makes the **doctrine of election in** regard to faith the **publica doctrina,** and holds this position to the testimony of truth.

The authors of the thesis refer especially to Joh. Gerhard, whose way of teaching they can put up with. But Gerhard stands in his

The doctrine of the election by grace is essential just as the other respected dogmatists of the 17th century, Calov, Quenstedt, etc., are. If he also in the above quotation and otherwise does not want to let faith count as **causa meritoria** or as **causa efficiens of** election, if he also emphasizes that faith alone is God's work and with the expression **intuitu Christi fide** ***apprehendendi,*** not **apprehensi,** points out that faith in Christ is God's will and order for the elect, in which, by the way, the others also agree with him; indeed, in the **Articulus de Vita aeterna,** § 74, Gerhard also confesses Augustine's sentence: "There (in eternal life) will be revealed what is now hidden from us; there will be revealed the cause why this one is chosen and that one rejected"-he also, for his part, puts faith conceptually before election. He constantly declares the **προέγνω,** Rom. 8, 29, as **praevisio fidei,** designates faith as the precondition of election, as something antecedent to election, **praedestinatio praesupponit Dei πρόγνωσιν, superior electione praescientia, beimmt bie praedestinatio ad vitam aeternam alg voluntas consequens,** and combats the Augustinian propositions: **electi sumus, ut credamus; fides est effectus praedestinationis. Locus de Electione et Reprobatione**, § 78. 90. 151. 152. 159. 170. 174. And hereby he has strayed from Scripture and confession. The next question is, how Lutherans are to take their stand on this error of Gerhard's, and of the later dogmatists in general. This we can no better expound than by recalling a few sentences from Walther's article, "The False Props of Modern Theology from the Open Questions," "Lehre und Wehre," 1868. There, p. 233 ff., he opposes the position of the Iowans, who held that the doctrine of Sunday, as contained in Scripture and in the symbols of our church, was an open question, not separative of the church, remarking that because so distinguished a teacher as Gerhard differed in it, every other teacher must be at liberty to differ in it. In this connection it is said: "It is true that one objects, is it right, then, by condemning an error of one now living, to condemn and heresy at the same time such great theologians, already triumphant before God's throne, as a J. Gerhard, a Selneccer, etc.? To this, however, we must first answer the same as our fathers once answered to a similar objection of the papists: **Patres fuerunt lumina, non numina, indices, non judices, ministri, non magistri,** the Fathers were lights, not gods, teachers, not judges, servants, not masters. If we do not wish to let the deviations of our Lutheran doctrinal fathers become either a rule of faith or a license for error against God's Word, we therefore follow only their own example and doctrine; not only do we then proceed with them as they have proceeded with the Church Fathers, but we

then also follow their express instruction not to set them and their writings above Christ and God's Word, but to examine everything and keep what is good. If we, as their disciples, did not want to do this, we would be unfaithful to them ourselves, and instead of honoring them, we would rather disgrace them in their graves. But as little as our fathers, when they condemned in the Papists the errors glossed over by the same with the Fathers of the Church, wished thereby to make heretics of the Fathers of the Church, so little do we, by condemning an error in one now living, wish now to condemn and heresy those old faithful witnesses and teachers of the truth, because they once, without being remembered for it, 1) and therefore not from obstinacy, but from human weakness, cherished the same error." S. 236: "We, on the other hand, declare that, to be sure, even our dear Lutheran doctrinal fathers were men, who could therefore err, and who soon here, soon there, really erred; but what was done by them out of weakness, and was therefore forgiven them, is not to be regarded by us with the eye of exaltation, but of love; not to be uncovered for their diminution, but to be covered up for the preservation of their blessing; not to be accepted by us now wantonly, and therefore in a condemnable manner, and to be used for doctrinal indifferentism, but to be shunned and used for that purpose. That we may become more and more vigilant, freer from all idolatrous reliance on men, even if they be the most eminent, wise, and holy, and more and more vividly conscious that the Scriptures alone are the perfectly pure source of truth, 'the only rule and guide by which at the same time all doctrines and teachers should be judged,' etc. . . . Therefore, while the ancient faithful teachers of our Church are otherwise our teachers and models, in their stumbling they are our warning signs, according to the well-known proverb: **Lapsus majorum sit terror minorum,** let the fall of the greater be the terror of the lesser. . . . As he that wilfully imitates the sins of infirmity of the saints, and thereby pleads the saints, sins against grace, so he that wilfully follows the orthodox in their errors of infirmity, and thereby pleads the orthodox, errs against grace." What is here said in general of the errors of the Doctrinal Fathers, is also true of the erroneous doctrine of grace election of the later dogmatists. And the doctrine of election by grace is after all even more important and closer to the center of salvation than, for example, the doctrine of Sunday. We do not declare those doctrinal fathers heretics because of their **syllogismus praedestinatorius.** They have "not been remembered." No Lutheran theologian of their day called their attention to the fact that they had departed from Scripture and the Confession in this piece. They had only the Calvinistic contrast in mind. Arguably

1) Highlighted by us.

but let us use them as a warning sign in our stumbling, and shun their error and renounce the same, after God has given us, out of vain grace, the right, full light on the election of grace. And now there is a great difference between the dogmatists of the seventeenth century, who were warned by no one on their erroneous path, and our opponents of today, who hold fast to the **intuitus fidei**, in spite of the fact that for decades the truth of Scripture, the genuine Lutheran truth, has been held up to them, and in so doing appeal to the process of the Fathers. But this is not to say that all those who today, in spite of all testimonies to the contrary, still teach like Gerhard, have willfully hardened themselves against the recognized truth. We do not judge hearts and minds. But we cannot possibly cultivate unity of faith and church fellowship with them as long as they persist in their error; for in so doing we would declare their error indifferent and be guilty of doctrinal indifferentism.

Our Lutheran Confession precisely defines the boundaries of church communion. In the 10. Article of the Formula of Concord, **Epitome, Affirmativa**, § 5, we read: "We also believe, teach, and confess that no church shall condemn another, that one shall have less or more of the more useless ceremonies of God than the other, if otherwise in doctrine and all the same articles, as well as in the use of the holy sacraments, unity is kept with one another, according to the well-known saying: **Dissonantia jejunii non dissolvit consonantiam fidei**, Inequality of fasting shall not divide unity in faith." According to this, not equality of ceremonies, but unanimity, **consensus, in** doctrine, and indeed in all the articles of doctrine, is an indispensable requisite of unity of faith, or communion of churches. How often has this passage of our Confession been quoted in our publications, with "all" in bold type! And the doctrine of election by grace, of which the following, the 11th article of the Formula of Concord, is immediately concerned, is surely also one of the articles of doctrine which are clearly and distinctly revealed in Scripture. Ecclesiastical union between a church which confesses the Scriptural truth of election by grace, and another church which, contrary to Scripture, publicly teaches, defends, and propagates an election **ex praevisa fide,** would therefore be nothing but a manifest denial of the Lutheran principle of church fellowship, and nothing but sheer unionism. That our Confession is in harmony with Scripture in this respect, too, needs no proof for those who know the Scriptures. We need only recall the saying Gal. 5:9, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," and Luther's powerful commentary on this passage. The same writes in his "Detailed Explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians," St. Louis ed. IX, 644 ff., among other things: "Therefore the teaching must be an uninterrupted

and round golden circle, in which there must be no crack. For as soon as even the smallest crack enters, the circle is no longer whole." "In this piece we cannot deviate even a hair's breadth. For the doctrine is like the mathematical point, and therefore cannot be divided, that is, it cannot suffer anything to be taken away nor added." "Therefore if thou deny God in one article, thou hast denied him in all, because God is not divided into many articles, but all is in every one article, and one is in all articles." "We are certainly willing to keep peace with all, and to show them love, if they will but leave us whole and inviolate in the doctrine of faith. If we cannot obtain this, they demand love of us in vain. Cursed be the love which is kept to the hurt of the doctrine of faith, to which all things must give way, love, apostles, angels from heaven, etc." "Therefore we are to learn to make great and glorious the majesty and reputation of the Word. For it is nothing small, as the gushers think nowadays, but a tittle is greater than heaven and earth. For this reason we have no regard to love and Christian unity, but use the judgment seat, that is, we curse and condemn all who in the least pervert and violate the majesty of the divine Word. For a little leaven leaveneth the whole dough." We add some sentences from Luther's sermon "On Christian Armor and Weapons," quoted in Walther's "Church and Ministry," p. 127: "No, dear man, not to me of peace and unity, about which one loses God's Word; for thereby already eternal life and everything would be lost. It is not a matter here of yielding, nor of conceding anything, for thy sake, or for the sake of some men, but to the word all things shall yield, whether it be called enemy or friend." "Wherefore it is but a devilish and deceitful, crafty attempt, which pretendeth and requireth such things, that we should yield aught, and allow an error for unity's sake, that he may thus craftily lead us from the word." It is not only evil, therefore, when one himself departs somewhat from the word, but it is also a cunning attempt of the devil when, for the sake of unity, one "concedes something" to others or "concedes an error."

The scriptural and confessional principle of church fellowship just stated has been recognized by our Synod from the beginning, and has been followed, for example, in its position with the Grabauians and Iowans. In the preface to the 14th volume of "Doctrine and Precepts" (1868), p. 66. 68, it is specified as follows: "We cannot hold and treat as an open question any doctrine clearly taught in God's Word, or contradictory to God's clear Word, however subordinate and peripheral it may appear to be from the center of the doctrine of salvation, or however remote it may be in reality.

be." "If we deny that anything else can be counted among the open questions within the orthodox church than the so-called theological problems and such objects which are problematic in character, that there are therefore questions in the sense of modern theology, we rather only want to assert this, that in the orthodox church no justification may be granted to any error against God's clear word, that in the orthodox church it may not be released to depart from God's clear word even in the slightest point, that any such departure from God's clear word, even if it were only to deny that Balaam's ass had spoken, would require intervention against it within the orthodox church, and that, if all teachings, admonitions, warnings, threats, and all patience shown prove fruitless and ineffective in inducing the person or community in question to abandon its opposition to God's clear word, nothing but exclusion, or schism, could result. a schism can take place." From this it follows that no doctrine of election by grace contrary to Scripture may be released in the orthodox Church either. It never occurred to our Synod to tolerate as **publica doctrina** any **doctrine** contrary to Scripture and to the confession. Now, of course, the Scripture-inconsistency of the doctrine of election by grace of the later dogmatists has not been universally recognized from the outset. When the doctrine of election by grace became controversial at the end of the seventies of the last century, not all at once were all the individual questions which belonged to the domain of this doctrine clarified. Thus, at the beginning of the doctrinal controversy concerning the election of grace, not only in the Norwegian publications, but also in our Missourian publications, there were found from time to time such judgments as that the doctrine of the election of grace of the later dogmatists, in spite of the **intuitu fidei,** because the same regard the **fides praevisa** as the work of God, is not in principle a false doctrine. A distinction was made between doctrine and doctrinal trope. Accordingly, there was not always unanimous discussion of the toleration or non-toleration of **intuitu fidei.** We recall, for example, a lecture by D. Stub's on the election of grace. In "Illuminating Stellhorn's Treatise on the Doctrine of Grace Election," D. Walther as follows-and similar remarks still occur in later publications: "We have always shunned the doctrinal trope introduced into the Church by the theologian Ägidius Hunnius after Chemnitz' death, 'Mir sind in Ansehung des Glaubens erwählt' (I am chosen in view of faith), as a misguided one, and have declared ourselves against it because, first, it is taken neither from Holy Scripture nor from our creeds, and cannot be proved from them; and, secondly, because it is also very misleading and can easily lead to all kinds of errors, especially to the error that faith is man's own work and deed, by means of

that he has earned it, that God has already chosen him from eternity to blessedness. ... Therefore, even though we have always avoided and rejected the expression, "We are chosen in faith," we have never condemned it, but have always tolerated it when it has been used by unsuspicious people. If our opponents had done nothing more than use this expression, we would never have attacked them for it as false spirits." Walther, as we know, thought of the matter in such a way that, when the right concept of grace had gained room in the heart, the **intuitu fidei was** thereby corrected, as it were. But the more sharply the actual **status controversiae,** whether faith flows from election or vice versa, was brought into view in the doctrinal struggle with the modern representatives of the **intuitus fidei, the** more clearly the essential difference between the doctrine of the election of grace of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries came to light. And thus it has been repeatedly testified and more closely expounded and proved in "Lehre und Wehre" already in the early eighties, that the dislocation of the relation of faith to election among the later dogmatists, that the concept of election, according to which calling, faith, preservation in faith precede election, is contrary to Scripture and the Confession. Walther also declared, e. g., "L. u. W." 1883, p. 340, "that the doctrine of election by grace, which arose later in our church, was not the old one, originally Lutheran and confessional, but a new one." Here we are speaking of old and new "doctrine," not doctrinal form. The grace election doctrinal controversy, therefore, soon led to ecclesiastical divisions, because it was a question of what was according to or contrary to Scripture and the confession. The correct church fellowship principle was expressed at the Synod of Delegates at Fort Wayne, 1881, at which Walther's 13 propositions on the election of grace were adopted, in the following words, which we take from the Synodal Report in question (p. 29): "All the world knows that two doctrines of the election of grace, differing in the deepest sense, are now advanced in our midst. This was already the case at the time of the general pastoral conference in Chicago, and it has not changed since then. But to see such a thing with us is an unfamiliar thing to all people. The general expectation, therefore, is, that the Synod at present assembled, as such, will confess which of the two doctrines alone shall have validity in its midst. We have, therefore, for many reasons, the duty to declare without hesitation to the Church and to the world: This doctrine, and this doctrine alone, is the doctrine of the Synod; we will not tolerate any other doctrine among us. He who cannot and will not confess with us the doctrine we have confessed, cannot wish to belong to us, nor we to him." For the rest, what has been said above about the aberrations of the doctrinal fathers also applies here: what was formerly said on our part, either before the doctrinal controversy or after it began, that is erroneous or oblique, we are not to say because we said it formerly,

even now, after the doctrine of election by grace has been considered on all sides and worked through and fought over for three decades, hold fast or declare it to be an indifferent thing and treat it as such. God's Word is and remains the sole rule and guide of our doctrine, as of our ecclesiastical practice. And so, as far as the question of church fellowship is concerned, we are guided by God's Word alone. And there the one word alone is decisive and resounding: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Where in the aforementioned article of the "Kirketidende" it is said that the use of the other doctrinal form is not church-dividing, it is added: "Only the other form of doctrine must not be abused in the service of synergism." And then it is further remarked, "If, then, the theses on 'calling' and 'conversion,' to which all the members of the committee - except D. Schmidt, who did not agree with them, and D. Böckmann, who was in Norway that year-agreed, were accepted as they read, and as it was declared, before the vote was taken, that they must be understood, then there can also be unanimity in the doctrine of election by grace." During the last three decades it has been repeatedly emphasized and proved on our part that every theory which conceptually places faith before election contradicts the **analogia fidei** or the **clara scriptura**, that is, the passages of Scripture which deal **ex professo** with the election of grace. The same does not become false and perverted only by the addition of another error. The **intuitu fidei is in** itself contrary to an article of faith and doctrine, the very article of election by grace clearly revealed in Scripture. And so the public use of the so-called other form of doctrine is in itself an obstacle to church fellowship, even if no synergism should be connected with it. Now, however, the **intuitu fidei** is defended and exploited by our present opponents in a synergistic sense. We know of none among the present representatives of the intuitu **fidei** who would be entirely free from synergism. Nor have the representatives of the other two Norwegian synods, in accepting the theses on vocation and conversion, in any way renounced the synergism which has hitherto prevailed in their synods. For it was this that we found chiefly objectionable in those theses, that they are so framed that synergistic ideas also find cover among them. Incidentally, already in the work of Aegidius Hunnius and other dogmatists of the seventeenth century, **intuitu fidei** went hand in hand with aberration in the article on conversion, with the view that conversion depended on the non-resistance made possible by **gratia praeveniens.** And so, by freeing the "other form of doctrine," the door would be opened not only to a doctrine of election by grace contrary to Scripture, but also to synergism.

A final word. The foregoing examination of the Norwegian Unification Theses is at the same time, in so far as the Norwegian brethren believe it to be true, an urgent request and invitation to examine whether the path to unification taken here is really in harmony with God's Word and beneficial to them and their church. Certainly, nothing would please their former comrades in faith and struggle from other synods more than if the old brotherhood remained intact and a possible union with the other Norwegian church bodies was not sought on the basis of the above theses, but on the basis of an unequivocal confession of the truth, with the exclusion of any error. And since these theses have become known in wide circles through the "Kirketidende" and other church bulletins, the above assessment is at the same time intended as a general warning against going astray. Doctrinal indifferentism and unionism are generally in the air and are also a danger to our Lutheran Church. If, instead of a clear and distinct knowledge and exposition of doctrine, we were to give way to a vague and ambiguous discourse on divine things, or if we were to give away even a shred of the truth we have recognized, or if we were to release even a seemingly minor error that we have recognized as such, our previous doctrinal position would be shaken, the fruit of many years of doctrinal struggle would be lost, and the possession of pure doctrine would be endangered. God, in His mercy, protect us from this! May God help us to keep what we have and to reject every temptation to deviate to the right or to the left!

G. St.

The undersigned thinks it fair to point out that he has already publicly given his judgment in the matter just discussed. The note signed "Redaktion" in "Lehre und Wehre", Jahrgang 1884, p. 183 f. 212, was written and published by him, naturally on behalf of and with the consent of the other members of the theological faculty (Walther, Günther, Schaller, Lange). The expressions under consideration, as well as the conditions, are now essentially the same as they were 26 years ago. It is namely a question of the double meaning of "can" (objective and subjective possibility), of the rejection not only of natural powers for conversion (Melanchthon), but also of so-called "gift powers" (Latermann) before conversion, etc. And as to the relations, it was also then asserted on the part of Ohio that the Norwegian theses presented nothing but the Ohio doctrine "**over against the Calvinistic innovations of Missouri and its allies,**" while Mr. D. Schmidt thought that "the Missourian-minded" had "perhaps" "begun" to become uncertain. But they had "not made a single concession on any point," and it would have been

"Therefore it is equally possible that the Missourians will regard the outcome of the conference as a great victory for their doctrine. 2) At the same time, our earlier judgment takes into consideration an article by Mr. D. Koren published in "Lehre und Wehre" (1884, p. 170 ff.) about "the Norwegian Pastoral Conference and Prof. Stellhorn". In this article Mr. D. Koren says, among other things, "We deny to the unconverted man not only natural, but also 'powers given by God,' so that consequently what takes place in him at conversion, if it is to take place, must be done merely and solely by the working of the Holy Spirit. The opinion, therefore, cannot be, according to the wording, that in those words anything of free choice, self-decision (to refrain or not to refrain) is statuted, for this would necessarily presuppose an already existing power (natural or given) in the man, because only through such a power would the self-decision, the necessary 'good conduct' of the man become possible. . . . We will grant him (Prof. Stellhorn) that he would have the right to exult, and that he could conceive of this 'could' as an active capacity, either natural or wrought by antecedent grace, in all men, as a will so far liberated (etc., the common story of man's conduct) - if we had said no more than what he takes out of our sentence. But if, in the same breath, we expressly add, that to this 'refraining from reluctance' there is found in the unconverted man neither innate nor God-given powers, ... we do not see what gives Prof. Stellhorn the right to his opinion. That 'might refrain' cannot, in the context in which it stands, be understood otherwise than it is meant, namely, as the real possibility set by God for all, a possibility which consists, therefore, in God's approaching all men in his holy word with the same grace (**sufficiens et efficax**) who hear the word. . . . According to Joh. 3, 6, Luk. 11, 3 we do not know of any intermediate state, in which man, though not converted, should not be in the state described by St. Paul Rom. 8, 6. 7, in which the reluctance should have ceased and a kind of interregnum should have occurred, or where any power to do good or to refrain from evil should have been given to the still unconverted man. Against this stands our Thesis 5. See the Formula of Concord, S. D., Art. II, § 83, where it is taught that every power (the 'ability' as a subjective quality) is only wrought by the Holy Spirit at the moment of regeneration. When we say in Thesis 5: 'Before conversion has taken place, there is found in the man who is an object of pre--conversion the power of the Holy Spirit', we are saying: 'The power of the Holy Spirit is found in the man who is an object of pre--conversion'.

2) L. u. W. 1884, 170 f.

If the Spirit is not an indwelling power for good or for giving up resistance to God,' where then will Prof. Stellhorn find room in our doctrine for the "conduct" of man 'in view of which' God should have made His decree of conversion?" So far Mr. D. Koren in "Doctrine and Reproof," 1884.

Our judgment on the Norwegian theses was threefold and read as follows: "1. There is no doubt in our minds that all members of the Norwegian Synod who understand the theses dealing with conversion in the sense presented by Praeses Koren agree with us in the pure Lutheran doctrine of conversion. 2. (2) Prof. Schmidt and his followers should honestly find their doctrine of conversion not expressed in them. It is true that the expression "might fail" is in itself ambiguous; for it may serve on the one hand to denote **gratia efficax** and **sufficiens, and to** mean that no man is unconverted from a want of God's grace, but merely through his own fault, resp. Secondly, the expression could also mean that, before conversion, there is an **arbitrium liberatum,** according to which man has the subjective ability to leave off willful reluctance, in order to be converted only after he has left off willful reluctance. But this latter view is excluded, especially by Thesis 5, in which it is said that in man, "before conversion has occurred," there is no indwelling power to abandon resistance to God. According to this, the actual refraining from wilful resistance coincides with conversion, but by no means precedes conversion as "conduct," and the subjective faculty of "being able to refrain" is created only by conversion. 3. (3) That Prof. Schmidt and his comrades would misuse the expression "to refrain" could have been foreseen by the dear brethren in the Norwegian Synod. . . . It would therefore have been better and would have served the clarification of the situation in the Norwegian Synod better, if only such expressions had been used, which exclude error from the outset. . . . We are in general of the opinion that the way taken, to reach the not yet existing consensus by a common formulation of certain theses, without adding the antitheses which have come to light, is not the right one and will never lead to the goal."

The undersigned is of the opinion that the three points of criticism still cover the facts of the case. In a discussion we had with two of the Norwegian brethren concerning the theses of calling and conversion, it became clear that these brethren associate a true-believing meaning with the theses. Their discourse was essentially a repetition of the written exposition.

We also believe that we would be judging the Ohio-Iowasch-Smith doctrinal position too favorably if we were to admit that this doctrinal position is expressed in the wording of the theses, or that we could even justifiably refer to the wording of the theses. Finally, we again hold, as in 1884, that the clarification of the situation required the addition of antitheses in which the opposing synergistic error is exposed and explicitly rejected.

We would like to add a few remarks that are intended to help in the proper evaluation of some expressions. When false teachers misuse certain expressions, these expressions easily come into disrepute. But these expressions must not be taken away from us if they are in accordance with Scripture and the confession. It is then sufficient to reject the abuse by means of antitheses.

Thus the expression "vocation," vocation taken in distinction from conversion, has been greatly misused. The expression has been used to ascribe to man spiritual powers and an **arbitrium liberatum** even before conversion. Through vocation, as distinguished from conversion, man is supposed to acquire powers with which he can afterwards send himself to conversion, decide in favor of conversion, behave rightly in conversion, etc. And this abuse is not found only among the more recent German and American synergists, but already among Latermann and the Helmstedters in the 17th century. Musaeus, too, is thoroughly impure in this respect, and Luthardt is indignant at Calov for opposing Musaeus and the Helmstedters so decisively. 3) The synergists put too much into calling, the word used in distinction from conversion. On the other hand, Calvin denies "calling," taken in distinction from conversion, altogether. He teaches that where conversion does not actually take place, there no divine calling has taken place; there God does not reveal his gracious will, but there he conceals it; there God gives no power to accept, but there he uses the word only to harden^). What is to be done under these circumstances? To the Synergists it is to be held that by calling, as distinguished from conversion, no powers whatever are made proper to man, by which he can decide for conversion. To Calvin it is to be held: Divine calling is a divine quantity in itself, quite apart from success. To be sure, in most passages of Scripture "calling" is a synonym of "conversion." But vocation, as distinguished from conversion, is also a scriptural! term. It is found in Matth. 20, 22, Luk. 14,16 etc.

3) The Doctrine of Free Will, p. 311.

4) Institutiones III, 24, 8. 12. 15.

"The Formula of Concord says, 5) "And we ought not to regard such a saving of God, which is done by the preaching of the Word" (and applies to all hearers of the Word), 6) "as mirror-fighting, but to know that by it God reveals his will, that he may work in those whom he thus calls by the Word, that they may be enlightened, converted, and saved. For the word by which we are called is the ministry of the Spirit, which gives the Spirit, or by which the Spirit is given. . . . With this revealed will of God we ought to be concerned, to follow it, and to make use of it, because 'the Holy Spirit, by the word whereby he calleth us, giveth grace, power, and ability to do it." The expressions: Grace, power "give," "bestow," "bestow," etc., are also used to denote the objective power and efficacy of the means of grace, apart from whether men are converted thereby or not, as is evident from the words of the Confession quoted, and as Luther says in the well-known words, "A king gives you a castle; if you do not accept it, the king has not lied about it." 7) We have every reason to emphasize this, since we are all inclined to judge the power and efficacy of the means of grace according to success (**ex sensu**), rather than according to God's word and promise.

Through misuse, expressions such as these easily come under suspicion: "possibility of conversion," "opportunity for conversion," "being converted or able to be converted," etc. Old and new synergists, in fact, use these expressions exclusively, or limitingly, in the sense of "God only makes conversion possible, not actual; God only works that we may believe, not that we actually believe; God gives the power to believe, not the act of believing itself. If God, it is further argued, were to make conversion not merely possible, but real, etc., conversion would be a compulsion and Calvinism inevitable. 8) This expresses gross synergistic false doctrine. God does not merely give the power, but also the act of faith. 9) Nevertheless, we do not let the expressions "possibility of faith," "being able to believe," etc., be taken away from us. It is quite scriptural to speak of a possibility of conversion for all who live under the sound of the Word. Thus it is said, Isa. 55:6, "Seek ye the Lord, because he is to be found" (XXXXXX), that is, can be found, can be believed in, the possibility of faith in him is present. Hence the orthodox teachers of the sixteenth century and our Confession speak thus. Luke Osiander speaks of a conversion opportunity and conversion possibility, if one has the word. He says to

5) P. 710, § 29. 33. 6) P. 710, § 28. 7) St. L. XIX, 946.
8) Luthardt, op. cit., p. 276. 9) Phil. 1, 29; Eph. 1, 19. 20 etc.

Is. 55, 6: **Tum Dominus prope est et inveniri *potest,* cum per evangelii praedicationem nobis salutem offert. . . . Quare grata mente *occasionem,* qua Dominus ad nos clementer accedit, arripiamus**. The Formula of Concord: man ***potest* ad bonum per gratiam Dei.** [10]) We, too, must by all means hold to these expressions. It is quite necessary to do so in order to express the **gratia universalis, efficax et sufficiens.** No hearer of the Word remains unconverted from a want of the gracious disposition of God, and from a want of the operation of God's grace. The cause of non-conversion is merely the persistent reluctance of man. Isa. 5, 4: "What more shall men do in my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Matt. 23:37: "Ye have not willed." In short, in order to confess to Calvinism the **vocatio seria et efficax with** respect to all hearers of the Word, we speak scripturally of a conversion possibility. This is not inappropriately called the "objective possibility." Now if the synergists make of the objective "can" a subjective "can" before conversion, we exclude their error by antitheses, but hold to the scriptural and confessional expressions.

As for the expression that before conversion man also possessed no "indwelling power" whereby he could decide for grace, a review of the synergistic controversies of the seventeenth century is necessary for its understanding. Synergism reared its head again with power in the 17th century, albeit under a somewhat different headgear. Whereas Melanchthon and his followers in the sixteenth century ascribed participation in conversion virtually to the natural powers of man (**liberum arbitrium est facultas se applicandi ad gratiam**), Latermann and his followers in the seventeenth century taught that man cooperates in conversion or decides in favor of conversion not from natural but from "bestowed powers." Now, however, a great struggle broke out once again over the doctrine of conversion. Even such theologians as had in the doctrine of election by grace the **intuitu fidei** contrary to Scripture, and had at times spoken **securius of** conversion, very decidedly rejected Latermann's doctrine. They taught and confessed: Man is and remains dead in sins until he is converted. There is no principle of life (**principium vital**) in man before conversion. He possesses no endowed spiritual powers which he could use and with which he could decide for conversion. **Donatio virium spiritualium** (so that spiritual powers are subjectively proper to man) **est ipsa conversio**, not a preliminary stage of conversion. 11) But because they could not deny

10) S. 593, § 23.

11) The proofs in Walthers Baier III, 223 ff. 202-209. These and other documents are also communicated in the dogmatics of the undersigned, which is now in the process of being printed.

nor wanted that in most (not in all) cases influences of God on man precede the kindling of faith for a longer or shorter time, so they declared: these are influences from outside, an external suppression (**refrenatio) of** enmity against God, whereby man remains **objectum convertendum** and no spiritual powers are inherent in him. Quenstedt and Calov expressly reject Musaeus' doctrine of the **boni motus** before conversion.12) Luthardt even accuses Calov that the same, in rejecting any cooperation for conversion, still surpasses the Formula of Concord) In short, the expression that man before conversion also possesses no "indwelling power," whereby he can decide for conversion, behave rightly, etc., excludes - taken in the old ecclesiastical sense - the Latermannian, Luthardian, ohio-iowaschen etc. Synergism.

With regard to the doctrine of election by grace, the judgment of 1884 stated: "Thesis 12 is called '**anceps**' by Mr. P. Koren himself; it is therefore not suitable either to confess the truth or to exclude the opposing error, just as one did not yet want to negotiate about the election by grace. If this is later expressed by the work of the committee, which Mr. Praeses Koren states concerning Thesis 12, then the pure Lutheran doctrine will also be known with it." After Mr. Praeses Koren has explained in what sense the word "rule" has been used by him and others, namely, in the sense of manner or order of election (on the basis of Christ's merit and in the way of calling, righteousness, and beatification), he adds: "He (Prof. Stellhorn) claims to know by what rule God has judged Himself in '**discriminating between** man **and man,**' although the Lutheran Church confesses that when we see that 'one is hardened, blinded, given into perverse mind, another , We ought to count this among the mysteries which God reserves to his wisdom, and in which we ought not to follow, conclude, or ponder unfar off thoughts, because God, through Paul, has set us a certain goal as to how far we ought to go. At the expense of which truths Prof. Stellhorn has succeeded in rhyming together what the Lutheran confession has not been able to rhyme together, is often enough proved to him in this journal." Now, as far as the present Theses are concerned, their intention is to present the teaching of Scripture and the Lutheran Confession, not the teaching of the 17th century dogmatists. In the note to Thesis 10, the teaching of the 17th century dogmatists is explicitly distinguished from the teaching presented in the theses. One must also

12) Quenstedt, Systema II, 729; Calov, Loci X, 149.
13) op. cit., p. 302.

The first thesis says that the doctrine **of election by grace belongs to** the "hard food". He already cannot accept it when it says immediately in the first thesis that the doctrine of election by grace belongs to the "hard food". For what the **Intuitu fidei people** call election by grace is - as D. Walther has often reminded us - nothing more than this, "that God has already decided from eternity to make all those blessed who live and die in faith," and this does not belong to the "hard food" of the more practiced Christians, but to the milk for young children. 14) Furthermore, the consistent **intuitu fidei** people cannot accept when it is said in Thesis 4 that "nothing in us" but God's mercy and Christ's merit alone is the **causa electionis,** and when in Thesis 5 faith is also excluded from the causes of election. Nor can the consistent **Intuitu fidei people put up with the fact** that in Thesis 7, to the words, "Between the general will of God's mercy and eternal election, according to God's word, there is no contradiction," is added, "though we cannot make this out before our minds." The **intuitu fidei theory** is, after all, by its very intention and nature, a rationalistic harmonization between God's general will of grace and eternal election, and there remains, as regards the relation of these two doctrines to each other, not the slightest difficulty for our understanding, as Walther says in the passage quoted and elaborates further. Therefore all who are serious about the **Intuitu fidei**, and therefore understand faith in the sense of "**conduct**," should also protest against Thesis 8, in which it is said that the Scriptures do not lead us beyond Hos. 13, 9: "Israel, that thou shouldest perish, the iniquity is thine; but that thou shouldest be saved, it is my grace only", and also refers to Rom. 11, 33-36: "How incomprehensible are his judgments, and his ways unsearchable! For who hath known the mind of the Lord?" etc. But, nevertheless, our judgment is that through the theses there runs a - we would say - timid tone. They are more defensive in the sense that the fear of being accused of Calvinism predominates. This fear does not permit the decisive thetical exposition of the doctrine of Scripture and the Confession, which is required by the circumstances of the time. How strongly the work of slander must have been carried on among the Norwegian Lutherans by the synergists, that our brethren in the Norwegian Synod should see themselves induced to defend themselves at every turn against the accusation of Calvinism! Thesis 10, in which the definition of the Formula of Concord of the election of grace is to be presented, is indeed based namely on **F. C.,** p. 708, § 23. But in this very thesis, in the words that God by the election of grace

14) The Doctrine of Election by Grace in Question and Answer, p. 56.

from eternity, for Christ's sake, "considered every one of the persons," the addition of the confession "of the elect" ("all and every person of the elect") should not be omitted, but added. Above all, however, we lack in these theses an antithesis in which the **intuitu fidei**, and in general every doctrine according to which the faith of the elect conceptually precedes their election, is rejected as not scriptural and confessional. The doctrine according to which the faith of the children of God is conceptually placed before their eternal election is and remains in every formulation a human thought, and we must under all circumstances deny a human thought its justification in the Christian Church. But what about "unity of faith" and "toleration" in regard to the representatives of the **intuitu fidei**? Not only Walther, but all of us, have always distinguished between intuitu **fidei** and **intuitu fidei *minus*** synergism. And this distinction is justified. It must be made, if one does not want to improperly lump into one class two classes of people who are wholly different according to their inner position. If a heart is free from synergism, and hangs on grace alone, many an error which a man still cherishes in his mind will be corrected in him and made harmless. This, indeed, is what Lucher so often points out when he says that from the pure doctrine of justification all errors in other doctrines are easily recognized and annulled.15) Nor did Walther merely indulge in figures of speech when he applied this to the later theologians who have the **intuitu fidei *minus*** synergism. For the matter practically turns out thus: with **intuitu fidei *plus*** synergism, that is, plus the doctrine that faith and blessedness depend not only on God's grace, but also on man's conduct, I look at myself and my conduct in the question of my blessedness and election, and thus tear myself loose from God's hand of grace. With **intuitu fidei** mrnAs synergism, on the other hand, that is, if, in spite of **intuitu fidei, I hold to the** doctrine that my faith and my perseverance in the faith also do not stand in the thousandth part on myself, but solely in God's hand, I do not look to myself, but solely to God's grace and God's work of grace in the gospel, in the question of my election and blessedness. I do not tear myself away from God's hand of grace, but on the contrary, I place myself wholly in God's hand of grace. Such a vast difference is between those who teach **intuitu fidei *minus*** synergism and those who teach **intuitu fidei** synergism. The former are dear, good people who, because they are attached to **sola gratia in their** hearts, have understanding of Christianity. We act

15) St. L. VIII, 627 et seq.

We would like to discuss with them the relationship of faith to the election of grace, and there are truly the best prospects that we can free them from the weakness of knowledge that they still have on this point. Of course, if the negotiations are to lead to a goal, it must be shown and absolutely maintained that the **intuitu fidei** is a human idea and can never claim justification in the Church. On the other hand, negotiations with synergists about the relation of faith to the election of grace are a futile effort as long as they remain synergists. We ourselves, of course, have repeatedly participated in this futile effort, because we wanted to avoid the appearance that we were not interested in a doctrinal agreement. We have achieved nothing with the synergists. The situation is like this: Those who hold to synergism have no understanding of Christianity. Christianity is the religion of grace; but the synergist holds that God beatifies those who are better than others. He takes offense at the cornerstone Christ, like the Jews who also wanted to be better than the Gentiles. The synergist talks about "faith." But the faith he means is a faith that depends not on God's grace alone, but "in some sense" on man himself. Faith is a monstrosity and remains a monstrosity whether one places it before or after the election of grace or elsewhere. With synergists, therefore, it is not to be negotiated where their "faith" is to be placed, but it is to be stated and maintained to them that their faith must be put out of the Christian Church. Those who hold to the **intuitu fidei *plus*** synergism do not come out as dear, good people in negotiations with them, but they lash out wildly, scold very much, and probably declare those to be Calvinists, apostles of the Teusels, etc., who do not want to accept their false doctrine. There can be no question of unity of faith with people who advocate **intuitu fidei *plus*** synergism. Nor can they be tolerated in the church. But if one is dealing with people who, as far as one can judge, honestly and sincerely profess the **sola gratia**, one can deal with them about the relation of faith to the election of grace, if they are ready for such negotiations. In this case there are good prospects of agreement. Such people were also in the mind of D. Walther had in mind when he spoke of "toleration". In this toleration a twofold thing is presupposed: 1. that the **intuitu fidei is** not acknowledged to be justified, but is declared to be contrary to Scripture and the confession; 2. that negotiations take place which have the purpose of removing the dissent. In short, one keeps God's Word out of the plan in this case. Either God's Word heals the damage or it establishes a clear relationship with those who refuse to accept it.

As for the words quoted at the end of the theses from Gerhard, they have been used repeatedly also by Walther in the same sense. Now there is no doubt that Gerhard has the **intuitu fidei, which is** contrary to Scripture. But at the same time Gerhard is probably the one among the later dogmatists who has carried out this theory least consistently. Thus he contributes many quotations from Augustine which do not really fit into the framework of the theory of foreknowledge. Likewise, Gerhard falls factually out of the framework of this theory when he says, in the words quoted, that in election God looked upon **nihil boni, neque ipsam fidem** in man. And when he goes on to say that the election was made "in view of the merit of Christ **per fidem** apprehendendi**,** *" which can* be apprehended by faith or a little further down (§ 165): "in view of faith, **in tempore** ***per verbum conferendae", which is*** to be ***conferred in*** time by the word, then factually an election to faith comes out of it, if no synergistic thoughts play into it. Gerhard therefore approves of Augustine's having taught an election to faith to the Semipelagians (§ 166). Not without reason, therefore, D. Walther counted Gerhard among the later theologians who, if they had been "reminded" by orthodox believers, would have returned to the scriptural and confessional doctrine of election by grace. But because Gerhard has the **intuitu fidei** contrary to Scripture, and, in order to prove it from Scripture, makes quite "inconsistent conclusions" (Walther), and reverses the Scriptural statements in question, he cannot be accorded the place of an exemplary teacher in regard to the doctrine of election by grace. F. P.

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. Oregon and Washington District Synodal Report with Negotiations on the Assurance of Salvation. (12 Cts.)
2. Synodical Report of the Michigan District, containing an edifying exposition of the Book of the Prophet Jonah. (15 Cts.)
3. Synodical Report of the Northern Illinois District, discussing for the teaching of our churches the damages of the Corinthian church. (17 Cts.)
4. Minnesota and Dakota District Synodal Report with the doctrinal theme, "Rome and the United States."
5. South Dakota District Synodical Report with negotiations on the subject: "Community Schools. " F. B.

**Beiträge zur praktischen Behandlung der biblischen Geschichte**. New Testament. By W. Wegener. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo. price: $1.00.

This volume of IX and 298 pages octavo, which we hope will soon be followed by the biblical stories of the Old Testament, we recommend to our teachers, school pastors and especially to all Sunday school teachers, to whom it will be of valuable service for the teaching of biblical history. F. B.

**Der Ev.-Luth. Hausfreund.** Calendar for 1911 by O. H. Th. Willkomm. Published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau i. S. Price: 40 Pf.

This calendar has been known to our readers for many years and no longer needs our recommendation. Among other excellent reading material, it offers the following articles this year: 1. "What will become of the little child?" Two: "Memorials to C.F.W. Walther." Three, "A Journey to Milan in Wintertime."

F- B.

LUTHER ALBUM. Illustrated by 24 engravings of Wm. Weimar's celebrated paintings of Luther's life, and a new Portrait, Dr. Martin Luther, by K. Astfalck. Submitted by *Martin S. Sommer.* Louis Lange Publishing Co, St. Louis, Mo. price: $1.00.

Like the German edition, "L. u. W." is also pleased to publish the English edition of this "Luther Album". Although this Luther biography is not based on original research, it is a popular, pleasing presentation of the known main facts from the always and everywhere interesting life of Luther, decorated with illustrations by Weimar and Astfalck. F. B.

PRAYERS. Submitted by *Martin S. Sommer.* Published by Rudolph Volkening, St. Louis, Mo. Price, 25 cts.; gilt, 50 cts. Postage extra 3 cts.

This small booklet, which on 94 pages contains numerous shorter and longer prayers, Bible verses and song verses together with several remarks on prayer and as an appendix on ten pages a list of Christian names with their meanings, is suitable as a gift for confirmations, weddings and similar occasions. F. B.

**The Worship of JEsu in the Age of the Apostles**. By D. Theodor Zahn. Published by A. Deichert. Price: 80 Pf.

In this excellent writing, D. Zahn opposes the liberals who, together with Geyer and Rittelmeyer, fight against the deity and worship of Jesus, and shows that already to the apostles and Christians at the time of the apostles the worship of Jesus is "as necessary and as effective as the worship of Jehovah demanded by the law and the prophets, and is even identical with it. Harnack claims that only the Father, not JEsus, belongs in the gospel. D. Zahn writes: "A recent exponent of Buddhism says: the Buddhist doctrine could be in all essentials what it is in fact, even if the concept of the Buddha were thought away from it. But what would a Christian doctrine be without Christ?"

F. B.

**Grundriß der Dogmengeschichte**. By Reinhold Seeberg. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 3.25; hardcover: M. 3.80.

In concise language, clear arrangement and pleasing form, this book offers on 158 pages the history of Christian doctrines up to the Tridentinum, the Formula of Concord and Calvin's theology, as it is treated in more detail by D. Seeberg in his "Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte". Of the present "Grundriß" it says in the preface: "The book intends to serve the audience of academic lectures. The sources and the more important literature, the basic ideas of the development, together with the main references, have been compiled in order to spare the lecturer the time-consuming dictation, the listener the mechanical copying, and to give him the opportunity to prepare himself for the lectures. In this the greatest brevity has been aimed at." It cannot be said, however, that D. Seeberg is always sufficiently precise and avoids vagueness and indeterminacy. Nor is there a lack of many an inaccurate judgment and representation. For example, p. 118: "He (Luther) has the dogmatic tradition

only dismissed in so far as it was incompatible with the faith of salvation." Unsatisfactory also is what is said p. 122 about Luther's doctrine **de servo arbitrio.** On p. 129 it is said flatly that Luther had taught consubstantiation since 1520. Not true are p. 130 Seeberg's statements about Luther's doctrine of inspiration. Seeberg also wrongly asserts that Andreas Osiander "did not without right" appeal from Luther for his doctrine of justification; further, that from the rejection of the **Stoica ανάγκη** follows the acceptance of the **facultas applicandi se ad gratiam.** It also remains incomprehensible how a man like D. Seeberg believes he can reproduce the contents of the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord in the following words: "Article 11 teaches that predestination is the cause of the blessedness of the elect, as the divine will that all who believe in Christ shall be saved. God foreknew before the time of the world which of those called would believe. But the **vocatio** is always serious, and the **promissio evangelii** general. " F. B.

**History and Criticism of Modern Theology,** especially of Systematic **Theology,** since Schleiermacher. By Br. H. R. von Frank. Edited and continued to the present time by R. H. Grützmacher. 4th edition. VIII and 532 pages. Published by A. Deichert. Price: M. 8.50.

Apart from the introduction, this work is divided into six sections. In the introduction, Frank discusses the preconditions for the advent of modern theology, especially "subjectivism" in theology and philosophy from the Reformation to rationalism. The first section treats in detail (pp. 56-135) Schleiermacher and his theology. The second brings the theologians first stimulated by Schleiermacher: Twesten, Nitzsch, De Wette, Hase, Lange, Rothe, and Schweizer. The third characterizes the speculative theologians under the spell of the monistic philosophy: Daub, Marheineke, Strauß, Bruno Bauer, Feuerbach, the Tübingeners, Biedermann, Pfleiderer, Lipsius. The fourth describes the revival and the union and treats the theologians: Klaus Harms, Löhe, Wichern, Fliedner, Ludw. Harms, Blumhardt, Tholuck, Neander, Hengstenberg, Julius Müller, Dörner, Köstlin, Beck, Martensen, Rudelbach, Harleß, Philippi, Kliefoth and Dieckhoff, Vilmar, Thomasius, Schmid, Kahnis, Höfling, Zezschwitz, Th. Harnack, Delitzsch, v. Hofmann, Volck and Luthardt, Frank (added by R. Seeberg). In the fifth section we meet the names: Ritschl, B. Weiß, A. Harnack, and Kaftan. In the last section Grützmacher treats of recent times with the following theologians: Harnack, Herrmann, J. Kaftan, Häring, Reischle, Kattenbusch, Th. Kaftan, Tröltsch, Kübel, Cremer, Kähler, Lemme, Zöckler, Öttingen, Ihmels, Stange, Seeberg, Beth, etc. In the preface to the fourth edition of this work, which he edited, Grützmacher says with reference to Frank: "For the special characteristic of Frank's work, that it approaches historical phenomena from the position of the systematist and with a firm standard of judgment, seems to me to be worth preserving even longer. After all, in the openness and clarity of the standpoint from which the evaluation is made lies both an advantage over that kind of historiography which proceeds all the more partisan with alleged partisanship and concealment of its dogmatics, and over a collection of notes which evades the question of truth and is insufficient precisely in the field of principled theology." Frank (and the same is true of Grützmacher), however, has a theological standpoint of his own, and by the same, of course, he judges the phenomena of the times. He who himself takes a standpoint cannot deny the same even in his praise and censure. He who stands liberal will condemn not only the old Lutheran, but every positive theology. And he who holds with the old theology of Scripture and its "It is written" and "Scripture cannot be broken" will sharply criticize not only the theology of Ritschl and its offshoots, but also the theology of all positive theologians who do not take the principle of Scripture entirely seriously. Frank and Grützmacher belong to the latter group. They seek to occupy an admittedly untenable middle position between liberalism and actual scriptural theology. Frank still wants faith, but no longer the principle of the old theology. And in his Be-

If the old faith is not founded anew, the old faith also becomes a new structure under his hand. Whoever is interested in a careful presentation of Frank's theological position and criticism of it from our point of view, we refer to the longer article in "Lehre und Wehre" 42, p. 65 ff. Frank is a subjectivist and a "scientific" theologian in the Hofmannian sense of the word. And he does not deny this point of view in his assessment of the theologians mentioned in the present book. His judgments, therefore, are often tolerant and mild toward error on the left and intolerant and critical toward the truth of Scripture on the right: the latter, e. g., when p. 256, the Missourians are reproached for denying "doctrinal development" and professing verbal inspiration as a clear teaching of Scripture; the former, in the judgments, e. g., of Schleiermacher, v. Hofmann, and all who do not regard Scripture as the sole ultimate source and standard of theology. Although this work of Frank's, especially as far as the correct evaluation of theological phenomena is concerned, goes astray and leaves much to be desired, no one will find a book in the present market from which he could better orient himself about German theology from Schleiermacher down to Harnack, Seeberg and Th. Kaftan than from this "History and Critique of Modern Theology" by Frank and Grützmacher. F. B.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**From the Synodical Conference.** 1. This year the Minnesota Synod celebrated its fiftieth anniversary and the Wisconsin Synod its sixtieth anniversary. At its last Synodical Convention the Wisconsin Synod resolved to revise its Synodical Catechism, and to publish an English Catechism and Hymnal. A happy fruit of the union of the Michigan Synod with the Michigan District Synod, which took place in May, is also that the institution at Saginaw has been reopened as a progymnasium of the General Synod of Wisconsin and other States, of which the Michigan Synod is now a member again. The "Synodal Friend" of the Michigan Synod will cease publication at the close of this year, and make way for the "Parish Journal." How members of the Missouri Synod have contributed to the reunification of the Michigan Synod with the Michigan District Synod, President Soll wrote in the "Gemeindeblatt" of the Wisconsin Synod: "The brethren from the Michigan District of the Honorable Missouri Synod have been very helpful. Repeated joint conferences were held, at which complete agreement of the Michigan Synod with the doctrine and practice of the Synodical Conference was stated and recorded with praise and thanksgiving to God." 4. Some months ago theRev**. W. C. Boese, president of the Canada District of the Missouri Synod,** reported **publishes a statement declaring, 'The practice of united prayer at the recent synodical conferences in Canada is an error which must not be repeated**.'" The ***Lutheran Standard*** also reports this, but under the headline, "**Fanatical Missouri**." What clear Scripture forbids us to do: Holding joint prayer services with General Synodists and other synods with whom we do not agree in faith, Ohioans call fanaticism. This is the way of the Uniate, who would have all who are in disagreement with the doctrine of

and the Word of God seriously and accurately, scold fanatics and disturbers of the peace. 5. The "Watching Church" writes about the Canadian intersynodal negotiations themselves: It was reported to it from competent quarters that "complete doctrinal unanimity prevailed among the participants. The papers hitherto dealt with on conversion, church, ministry, etc., had, so far as we had any insight, all been brought before the conference in a faithful Missourian version, and, if we are not mistaken, had been unanimously adopted." 6. With reference to Bro. Great's "Doctrines of Distinction," the Watching Church (p. 156) remarks: "To what use is this" (setting forth the doctrines of distinction of the Lutheran Synods)? "Does this lead to peace and unity? . . . Would that the Lutheran synods of this country would first become aware of all that in which they are united, and then learn to hold fast to the confession of the church, then all useless bickering and sinful quarreling as well as being right, by which we become a mockery before those of other faiths, would cease." According to the Formula of Concord, Lutherans must demand unity "in doctrine and all the articles thereof" from all whom they acknowledge as brethren in the faith, and to the divine truth of the holy Gospel they must yield nothing, nor concede anything to the least error. (Müller, p. 553. 725.) With this, evidently, the advice given by the "Watching Church" is not correct. 7. Germany has had many untrue things reported about the Missouri Synod for decades. Now again by Hans Haupt of Tonawanda, who, according to the "D. A. Z." (p. 245) in his book "State and Church in the United States" published there: "At first it was the Congregationalists of Massachusetts who expressed their fear that Catholics, Jews and unbelievers would now also be able to hold political office. The same fear was expressed again recently when the present President of the United States was agitated against during the election because he was a member of the Unitarian Church and had too friendly relations with Catholicism. The old opposition of the Puritans continues today, especially in the strict circles of the Lutheran Church." Hans Haupt, as far as Missouri is concerned, may have heard ringing, but not beating together. We know of no one from "the strict circles of the Lutheran Church" who has agitated against Taft for being a Unitarian. The polemic of the Missourians in New Orleans against the Masons has been widely noted. Papist papers also used the occasion to point out that Leo XIII and other popes had also condemned the Masons. But that they themselves have secret societies, and that at bottom the whole Roman Church with its hierarchy, its Jesuits and other orders is a closed secret society of the most pernicious kind, of this these Romanists say nothing. 9. According to the "Lutheran," the youth bulletin of the "United Church" (the Schmidtian) says: "Judging from what the German Missouri Synod is putting up for heathen mission, there cannot be much unity of faith in it." But does not the fact that the Schmidtians resort to such an argument prove that it is after all quite difficult to prove disunity of faith among the Missourians? (10) The Walther League, which met at Jackson, Mich. in July, now numbers 69 associations with 3783 members. It was especially emphasized that the League is not above or beside the churches, but is and desires to be under them. 11. The League, begun in Bom Jesus in 1903, and continued in 1905 by.

The school for the training of pastors and teachers for South America, which was transferred from our Brazilian District to Porto Alegre and adopted by our General Synod in 1908, is now called Concordia Seminary, had nineteen students last year, and moved into a newly rented, very suitable building at the beginning of this year. God bless the Brazilian Concordia! F. B.

**From the General Council.** 1. The endowment of Muhlenberg College is now $270,642. Concerning the resolution passed at its last meeting to raise two million dollars by 1917 for educational, missionary, and charitable purposes, and similar plans in other synods, ***Lutheran*** remarks***:* "Even to talk about raising $4,000,000 will do our people good. We must get used to talking in large figures.**" The late Senator Ericson, who bequeathed $56,000 to Augustana College, has also given about $10,000 to various other Swedish institutions. 3rd A **Lutheran Educational Conference** was held at Harrisburg, Pa. Represented were 16 schools, some of which belonged to the General Synod, and some to the General Council and Ohio Synod. It is hoped that in the future a general conference of all Lutheran institutions in America can be brought into being. Is not a secondary purpose of this to work into the hands of unionism? The German Synod of Canada and the English Synod of Central Canada, both belonging to the General Council, have already taken steps to open a theological seminary in Toronto, in connection with the university there. Financially this may be advantagehast; but for the Church we do not expect any gain from this linkage. 5. The "German Lutheran" (p. 409) writes about Bishop von Scheele, who was the main figure at the jubilee celebration of the Augustana Synod, and to whom a solemn reception was given by General Synodists and conciliarists in a joint worship gathering immediately after his landing in New York: Bishop von Scheele is "an enthusiastic friend of the Lutheran Church in this country, who sees the future of Lutheranism in our country in the harmonious standing together and cooperation of the Germans, English and Swedes in the General Council." But Bishop von Scheele is a member of the General Lutheran Conference, and also brought the greetings of that conference to the Augustana Synod; but the Council, according to the debates of the ***Church Review, is*** determined to depart from the General Lutheran Conference. F. B.

## II. Abroad.

**Afterthoughts on the Borromeo Encyclical**. That the Pope, by his declarations, has as good as annulled the Encyclical for Germany, regretted the effect of it, and denied the intention of offending it, has been celebrated in Germany as an extraordinary success of the Prussian Prime Minister. The "Reichsbote" says that the Chancellor has "achieved from the Vatican what no statesman before him has been able to achieve." Similar is the verdict abroad. The Spanish ***El Impartial*** wrote: "Devout, exceedingly humble is the attitude of the Vatican. The Prussian envoy has appeared vigorously in the corridors of the immortal palace. Monsignor Merry has surrendered on grace and disgrace. It is the first time that an encyclical has been issued by the pressure of the

secular power is cashed in." The Italian ***Messagero*** remarks: "The is the second, even more shameful humiliation of the Vatican. The case of a Pope, in order to prevent greater mischief, confiscating his own prose is without precedent in history. User of the many merits for liberal thought already possessed by the Vatican, the infallibility of Pius X and the clumsiness of Merry del Val have today acquired a new one. We must be grateful. **Sursum corda**!" And the French writes: "To the mild but dry and severe note handed down by Prussia, the Vatican has replied with a moderation which gives its answer the character of an apology. This reply amounts to a retraction of the encyclical. The Holy See has behaved more pliantly and conciliatorily towards the Prussian Government than has usually been its manner. The policy of utility of which it has shown itself capable would have been of advantage to it on other occasions. One could only rejoice to see in it the sign of a general change in his method." But it is precisely the policy of utility that the Popes have always, always pursued. For them there has ever been but one question: what maintains and promotes our rule? This end the popes have never lost sight of, even when, at times, their shrewdness failed them in the choice of means. And if the great success of the German Chancellor is now generally praised, it only shows how little even the greatest statesmen are able to achieve with the Vatican, for Pius X revoked nothing.

**The Protestants in Germany are divided**. Some are content with the Pope's declarations; others demand more satisfaction. Among the latter are many of the liberals. The "Wartburg" wrote: "The Pope must be forced to eat his encyclical, to retract his invectives." But how will the "Wartburg" accomplish this? More than **attritio**, gallows fidelity, fretting over the evil consequences, cannot, after all, be expected from the arch hypocrite in Rome. The "Evangelical League" has complained of the spineless attitude of the Government, and declares that the Papal retreat offers "no sufficient satisfaction for the grievous abuse of the German Reformation and nation." "The insult should have been regretted and withdrawn." The Federation therefore also holds that agitation and protest against the encyclical must continue. But many positives stand differently, who, with the government, see in the Pope's Church a confederate against liberalism and socialism, and therefore do not wish to sacrifice confessional peace at any price. Their slogan now is, "Let us cherish and emphasize what unites us with Catholics, not what divides us from them." And the Romanists agree. After all, it is now the best way for them to get over the factual situation that makes them uncomfortable. But apart from anything else, do not the Protestants forget that the Romanists are not to be trusted, and that everyone who has made a pact with Rome has yet been deceived? How far the friendliness to Rome goes among the Positives is shown by the following pronouncements. The "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" says: "It is unjust to study modern Catholicism through the spectacles of the sixteenth century." As if the Borromeo encyclical had not just

would have provided proof of the **semper eadem of** the papal church! If this encyclical is not enough, what else can be used to sting these stone-blind Protestants? The same paper writes: "Rome has a cat nature: she flatters and rubs her back against us, and knows how to talk quite nicely of the common Christian ground between the two denominations; but beware, when she comes to rule, she shows her claws!" Who, like Roosevelt, Taft, and countless Protestants in America, consoles them right back with the delusion "that German Catholicism is a very different organism from Papal, Jesuitism." And as Gibbons and Ireland, clever as they are, feed this delusion in America, so there is no lack of Romanists in Germany who make the Protestants believe that in a test case the German Catholics would decide for the Fatherland against Rome. The same paper writes: "We have this pithy Luther hymn ('Erhalt uns, HErr' etc.) in our hymnal. But one has changed the 'Und steur' des Papsts und Türken Mord' into: "And murder your enemies. We have learned to think somewhat differently of the papacy; we have long since seen in it a great institution of history, providentially permitted by God, even if we can never again recognize the papacy as the infallible representation of Christ on earth." The "E. K. Z." therefore instructs the Protestants: "Let us compete in faith and love with our Catholic brothers and let us not forget that there is an invisible church, a community of believers. In spite of everything, let us not destroy the last bridges which tell us that we are all members of the Body of Christ!" The same Romfreundlichkeit appears also in the "Reformation", in which Bunke even knows how to justify the Jesuit withdrawal of the Pope: "No prince, no state and church authority revokes a decree outright. They look for a way out. One cannot demand more from the Pope, the head of the Catholic Church, with the self-confidence that now exists." Not ask? Even if the Pope has lied shamefully? Surely only a Romanist who places the Pope himself above God and the moral law can write like that. And how mildly does even the "A. E. L. K." judge the Antichrist at Rome! It attributes the "licentiousness of the words in the encyclical, which know neither consideration nor prudence," to the "burning zeal of Pius X for the elevation of Catholic piety" and the "sincere sorrow for the decline of that piety"! Catholic piety consists essentially in idolatry of the Pope, blind submission to fine rule, and irreconcilable hatred of all who do not accept this piety. But is it meant, then, by the "A. E. L. K."? The "Chr. W." also thinks: one thing is certain with Pius X.: "What drives him is the feeling: you are responsible for the erring, you want to frighten them back from their error." What a confusion of Protestant judgment on the Roman Curia, whose maxim for more than a thousand years has been **Rule or ruin**!

**The pope had barbered the emperor magnificently over the spoon,** since encyclicals would not be read from the pulpits at all. This was the verdict of the ultramontane "Nürnberger Volkszeitung" and with it other centrist papers, which proclaimed themselves apologists of the pope. But the Modernist Schnitzer remarks in the "New Century": "The last remnant of the

Trust in the Holy See would have to be lost if what ultramontane papers triumphantly proclaim were to prove true: namely, that the Pope had beaten the German Chancellor to a pulp with his assurance that he intended to prohibit the promulgation of the papal encyclical in Germany! Truly, one can no longer put the reputation of the Church and the papacy at stake in a more frivolous manner." We have no doubt that the centrists are right. But the apologia is thus also transformed into the accusation that the pope is a swindler and is not afraid to swindle kings and princes. And this rhymes perfectly with the lies in the encyclical itself. The disgrace which the Pope has suffered must, however, have made the Romanists angry, otherwise they would hardly resort to such desperate apologetic arts as to stamp the "Holy Father" as a vulgar impostor. In order to justify the Pope and to silence the Protestants, the Papists also held "protest meetings" in some places, protesting against the fact that the Protestants complained so loudly about the beating administered to them by the Pope. The Holy Father, after all, had only called a cat a cat, and his description of the Reformation corresponded entirely to the facts, said a centrist paper in Karlsruhe.

**But not all Catholics shared this position**. The Wiesbadener Zentrumsblatt wrote: The section on the Reformation we must "sincerely regret in the interest of confessional peace". The Mannheim Katholikenblatt likewise judged the "unfortunate section" on the Reformation and declared: "A diplomatic masterpiece has not been achieved by the Vatican with this encyclical at the present moment. One will therefore only have to shake one's head regretfully at this Vatican pronouncement as a real politician." The "E. K. Z." writes: "The coarsest weapon that has been brought up against Rome from its own camp, as far as the material has come to my attention, is a letter from Tübingen university circles to the "Schwäb. Merkur". There it says, among other things: "Among the Catholic teachers and students of the State University the encyclical has aroused the most embarrassing moods and caused real bitterness. The outbursts are unnecessary, uncharitable, unjustified, because at the very least exaggerated, in several points simply unhistorical, untrue. Does one know nothing in Rome of the namelessly gloomy days and deeds of the papacy on the eve of the Reformation, of the low of religiosity and morality in Rome and Italy, which the Jesuit Tachi Venturini in his book: "**Stato della religione in Italia alia meta del seeolo** XVI" (Rom, 1908) has distinguished on record? Was it not the God of the belly, whom that famous Pope made serve, who allowed nude dances to be held in the rooms of the Vatican, that Leo X lived by the principle, as the pro-Rome historian Pastor admits: "Let us enjoy the papacy that God has given us"? Were the nations and princes who did not follow the Reformer less, or not at all, morally corrupt? It pains a Catholic to have to point these things out.'" In the same paper a priest wrote: "The tact alone, the prudence of an ordinary Christian man, should have sufficed to avoid phrases which, even if translated as mildly as possible, sound intolerant." The silence of the

The "Vorwärts" interpreted the Center's failure in the negotiations in the Prussian Diet on the encyclical as "a turning away from the pope. But the "D. Ev. K." judged more correctly: the Center had failed in a decisive hour and had again revealed and documented its blind submission to the Pope's decision, as well as its ultramontanism and complete lack of German-national interests. The "Center" is precisely a machine of the Pope, in which each member obliges itself to cadaverous obedience.

**In defense of the Pope, the high Catholic clergy of Bavaria issued the** following statement in the "Augsburger Abendzeitung": "According to its entire content, it is impossible that the Pope, who is the personification of peaceableness and who has the most sincere admiration and veneration for the **summus episcopus of** the Prussian Protestants, can be considered the creator or co-creator of the encyclical. Even if he had only read it, the insulting expressions would most certainly have been deleted. It is obvious that the author of the incomprehensible work, which rightly arouses Protestants, is the Secretary of State Merry del Val and his accomplices, a notorious ignoramus, not only of German conditions. Under Cardinal Rampolla, such a thing would not have happened. Persons who have just returned from Rome report that one is as much dismayed in the Vatican at the effect of the encyclical in Germany as one is enraged at its authors." With this apology, however, the clergy of Bavaria declare the "Holy Father" to be a conscienceless man who lets documents go out under his name which he has not even read, and who even afterwards does not correct this consciencelessness, nor does he recant the lying contents of the encyclical. Others have therefore drawn the opposite conclusion. They argue thus: The fact is, they say, that hitherto the whole wave of Protestant-Catholic wrath has poured down upon Pius X.-and no one in Rome has held up the shield to him. From this, they argue, it is evident that the Pope himself was the real author of this peasant machination, and that out of envy and gloating he had not been warned by his intriguing surroundings against the publication of the same. The first explanation would be proof of the pope's depravity, the second of that of his surroundings.

**The political coloration of the protests**, which could not be completely avoided, because the churches of Germany are state churches, and the center is nothing more than the political side of the papacy turned towards the German government, became strongly apparent at the great protestation meeting, which was held in the Protestation Church at Speier and which turned into "a formal migration of peoples from the whole area. The "Reformation" writes: "Already one hour before the beginning the Protestation Church was crowded with thousands. Other thousands surrounded the wide square and filled the adjoining streets. The Frankfurt Protestant church choirs that wanted to sing could not get to their places. Then the old Luther song resounded mightily like a stormy roar, and Pastor Werner illuminated the papal encyclical from a religious and national point of view, which he called a record achievement in the art of disparagement. In contrast to this more factual and fundamental illumination, turned

Pastor Klein, the former member of the Baden Landtag, turned in sharp turns to the current (political) side of the matter. After a comprehensive resolution had been adopted, the church gradually emptied, only to be quickly filled again with thousands, before whom the same speakers then spoke again." In his speech, Fr. Klein sharply criticized the less than aggressive attitude of the Emperor and Chancellor and called for more vigorous political intervention against Ultramontanism. In the "Old Faith" a witness reports of the meeting in Speier and Karlsruhe: "There in Karlsruhe the national-liberal party man and politician Everling spoke, here in Speier the one-sided political-liberal-accented city priest Klein from Mannheim. These gentlemen speakers let themselves be heard as one-sided politicians and were understood as such. With a fine instinct the centrist papers immediately sensed the stench of death of inner failure in the face of outward assembly bravura and stated, which was particularly embarrassing in Klein's case, that he was using the pulpit as a lectern, and that one-sided liberal politics were being practiced in the Protestant pulpit. The stream of eloquence flows deliberately consequentially as water on the mill of the national-liberal party cause. Thus the value of an ecclesiastical-religious protest collapses. The shouting and applause in the house of God at Speier, the theatrical-comedic wringing of hands for the new pledge of allegiance during the sermon, to which the pulpit orator Klein called out, did not fail to achieve the purpose of a sensuous enthusiasm, especially not among the natural, naively thinking rural population. After an hour, however, even the naive man sees in the intoxicating gold of this sensual claim, after all, the gold of deceit."

**Much capital has been** made by the **Evangelical Federation** out of the encyclical affair. Right at the beginning it was written: "We address to you, Protestants, the request: Help preserve the honor of our evangelical faith! The nation is unworthy who does not joyfully put all her eggs in her basket. And the Reformation is the honor of our German Protestant people! Therefore, all of you join the Evangelical League for the protection of German-Protestant interests! Let this be our answer in deed to the Pope's circular letter to the Roman Church!" "Join the Evangelical League!" so it sounded from all sides, and the number of its members is also said to have increased considerably. But many positive people overlooked the fact that the League is liberal-minded, that its protesters are deniers of the divinity of Christ, and that in many cases, as the "Old Faith" expresses itself somewhat too strongly, it advocates little more than "beer-bench Christianity," and that therefore the heritage of the Reformation is in bad hands with this League. It is true that soon after the first protests the "Reich", the "Reichsbote", the "Reformation" and the "Evangelische Kirchenzeitung" declared that enough was enough; the League should now stop protesting and agitating! But their reason was not, "The Bund is liberal and has long since abandoned the heritage of the Reformation," but, "In this way (of agitating) the confessional peace does not come about, which must not only be desired in principle, but actually cultivated." The most shameful slander in the Pope's circular is that the Reformers were "enemies of the Cross of Christ." But for this charge the liberals have every understanding and feeling.

lost. According to Harnack, the encyclical is not about saints and enemies, but about decency and good manners, as well as about the truth of historical research, primarily about the first, about the education of the backward Curia, so that it learns the modes of the 20th century. The reproach that the Reformers were "enemies of the cross of Christ" has only historical significance for Harnack and all liberals. Does not Harnack, who excludes Christ's cross and crown from the gospel of Christ, feel that, judged by the New Testament, he is indeed an enemy of the cross of Christ? With such people, however, the pope's encyclical cannot really arouse any religious, but at most aesthetic, scientific, and political feelings and motives. It is a pity, therefore, that these very liberals, who do the Reformation so much dishonor and give the Pope's attacks a semblance of justification in the eyes of the ignorant, are now allowed to behave, amidst the protests, as the chief criers in the controversy against Rome and as the saviors of the Reformation's honor.

**"The best response to Rome"** - much has also been said about this. The "G. d. G." writes: the best answer is strong support of the "Los von Rom" movement, an anti-Borromeo donation for the active promotion of the German Protestant cause in Spain and Italy, and therefore entry into the Protestant League. But does not such entry into a liberal alliance justify the Pope in the sense that now at least the Protestants are enemies of the cross of Christ, and that the Reformation naturally leads to such enmity? In the "Korrespondenzblatt" Father Wurth wrote: "We do not want to conceal from ourselves that many only 'protest' out of hatred against Rome, but judge even the Reformers as stuck in Roman nature and fight and hate the Reformation confessions with such vehemence that they do not even like to 'hear' them anymore. They esteem the Reformers as champions of liberty of conscience; they reproach the Reformers for still holding to a Christian doctrine at all. Therefore all our protesting will not make the tremendous impression on Rome that our inner unity ought to make. Apostolics, people like Drews and Häckel, and those who play a great part within our Church, but deny the absoluteness of Christianity, and teach that Christ has become equal to us in all things, do us more harm than all the spitefulness of Rome. The struggle against Rome is necessary, however, for St. Borromeo is still alive! It will be best waged with the spiritual weapons of the Reformation; but these say, 'Let the word stand!' And we want this to stand." The anti-Borromeo agitation becomes a blessing only in so far as it helps to bring the Church, which has been ravished by Papism and liberalism, back to the Scriptures and to the second article of the Lutheran Catechism. The Saxon "Free Church" hits the nail on the head when it writes: "A right deed response to Rome would therefore be if the 'evangelicals' in Germany, whose 'evangelical Christianity' has very much faded, wanted to return repentantly to the old Bible faith and bid farewell to the Apap (state churchism), which has harmed the Church almost as much as the Papa (the Pope as Antichrist)."

**One of the fruits of the anti-cyclical movement has been** the reduction in the number of Rome-friendly landmark sales, which are also spreading in Germany.

and similar celebrations. Thus, for example, at the laying of the foundation stone of the Catholic church in Wilhelmshaven, the mayor did not participate, giving as his reason the papal vituperations; and after the Bishop of Münster had cut the first sod, the representative of the navy grimly seized the spade, thrust it into the ground with the words: "Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott" ("A strong fortress is our God"), and after his speech pronounced a hymn of praise to the Emperor. Elsewhere, too, the usual participation in Catholic celebrations has ceased, a tension which, however, will probably not last long. Another fruit is the propagation of the protest movement in other countries. The anticlericals in Spain and Portugal, who had just been facing a battle with the Vatican, rejoiced and drew courage for their own struggle from the Pope's defeat. And that the Pope in Spain for the time being retracted his claws was at any rate partly due to the feeling of his own general unpopularity in consequence of the Borromeo encyclical. The effects were more palpable in Austria, where the Protestant church authorities appealed to the Ministry of Education for the publication of the German text of the vituperative encyclical in the Boniface Gazette. In the provincial towns protests were also addressed to the judicial authorities, asking for energetic redress. In the Hungarian Diet the Archbishop was interpellated: why had he published the encyclical? The latter excused himself by saying that he had not read it carefully and that he had by no means had "aggressive intentions" in publishing it. The other Hungarian bishops had refrained from publishing it. In the Prussian county of Glatz, which belonged to the archbishopric of Prague, the government immediately forbade publication. In Austria itself, however, further publications did not cease. When, however, the unrest increased as a result, the government published on July 16 an admittedly completely salty statement of appeasement, in which it was assured that an aggressive tendency against the Protestant Church and its confessors had been far removed from the publication of the encyclical. The "Neue Freie Presse", however, criticized the government's statement as quite inadequate and emphasized that there was, however, a disturbance of the confessional peace on the part of the Romans, and that the whole incident strengthened the general feeling that the Catholic Church in Austria enjoys a much higher state protection than the other religious communities, which is in full contradiction to the Basic Law of the State. After lengthy negotiations with the Ministry of Worship and Education, the Imperial and Royal Protestant High Church Council finally issued a decree on July 19 to all Protestant parish offices in A. B. and H. B., complaining about the publication of the encyclical with its "deeply deplorable remarks" and exhorting them to faithfully adhere to the biblical gospel made accessible to them by the Reformation. But the publication of the encyclical did not harm the Protestant Church in Austria either. Last year 3928 Catholics converted to the Protestant Church and 1131 Protestants to the Catholic Church. These numbers meant a waning of the Protestant movement. The encyclical letter of Pius X, however, gave a new impetus to the Los von Rom movement, especially in northern Bohemia. In Graupen a Protestant assembly ended with numerous conversions and

led to the founding of a local group of the German Evangelical Federation. In other places, too, the effect of the encyclical was a swelling of the Los von Rom movement. Finally, there is also a moral gain for Protestant Christianity from the encyclical affair. For in the whole affair the whole civilized world has received the irresistible impression that the "holy, infallible father" in Rome is a hypocrite, a dishonest broker, and two-faced diplomat. From Holland, where the encyclical also caused great unrest, it was reported: the Pope had explained to the Queen that her ancestors were not meant either. Immediately, however, it was asked from all sides: if the Pope denies even this, whom did he mean? Does the Pope really say what he means, and does he mean what he says? How can one determine what the Pope, who declares himself to be the sole infallible interpreter of the Bible, means by his words when he speaks in such a way that all the world misunderstands him? And where is the infallible interpreter who again interprets for us the words of the "infallible, holy Father" at Rome? Or shall we allow the Pope, like the Bible, to interpret his own words arbitrarily, today in one way and tomorrow in another, as he pleases and as suits him each time?

**The much quoted response of the "Tägliche Rundschau" in Berlin** to the papal encyclical reads: "We do not practice the cult of saints. But to see the figures of a Luther, a Melanchthon, a Zwingli denigrated, that triggers all the anger of which we are capable. We do not consider the German princes who supported the Reformation to be pure gold. But that they were the only ones who offered the possibility of a recovery of degenerate conditions, that remains their world-historical merit. . . . To turn from those days to ours: Which nations today are the most degenerate, which the healthiest and most prosperous? Belgium is groaning under a clerical yoke; Spain is decaying in a clerical swamp; nowhere is the Pope and the papacy less respected than in Italy. The Germanic peoples of Protestant creed bear on their shoulders the prosperity and progress of the world: Protestant Prussian Germany, Protestant England, Protestant Anglo-Saxon America. It takes, indeed, a grotesque ignorance to lie these things into their opposite. It takes more: a venomous malice against which Protestantism must rise like a man."

**Of the "success" of the encyclical movement** the "A. E. L. K." writes somewhat effusively: "The whole Protestant world has been aroused by it against Rome; everything that had but a drop of anti-Roman blood in it has united. The most indifferent were aroused and remembered that they were Protestants, and those who were consciously Protestant strengthened themselves for new deeds for the cultivation of the Gospel. It did not remain merely with meetings and protests; new places of care for the Gospel were created for the Diaspora, sums were made liquid to strengthen evangelical Christianity against Rome. Even the Evangelical League, so feared by Rome, gained mighty increase. No imperial word, no electoral slogan, would have been capable of producing so tremendous a Protestant movement as this papal encyclical. For the Catholics themselves, nothing, nothing at all fell

only embarrassment at all corners and ends, more or less successful attempts to cover up, a truly pitiful spectacle. For the rustic outbursts of joy over the encyclical that emerged here and there and the no less rustic knocking about with the Protestants that followed on from it do not count, because they were too uninfluential. The most bitter part of the matter, however, was the humiliation to which the Pope had to subject himself, being compelled by a Protestant envoy to forbid the pulpit announcement of his circular and to declare that he had not intended to offend anyone. And when the newspapers rightly report that he even declared against the Queen of Holland that he had not meant her Protestant ancestors, the humiliating is added to the ridiculous. For whom then did he mean, if the Protestant princes of the Reformation are excluded? In short, it will be admitted that since the Tridentum the papal see has suffered no such defeat, and not in the imposed struggle, but entirely of its own invention."

**The following counterpart to the Borromeo encyclical** was published by the "E. K. Z.": "The history of the Christian Church shows us a tremendous apostasy from the period of splendor of primitive Christianity. There arose haughty men, enemies of the cross of Christ, men of earthly mind, whose god was the belly. These, who arrogated to themselves the title of popes, were nothing less than fathers of Christendom. Instead of caring for the Word of God, they indulged in their pleasures, and were intent on nothing but procuring principalities for their bastards, the nepots, as they were called, and bestowing riches on them, which came to them abundantly through indulgences, St. Peter's penny, dispensations, etc. Thus of them the word of Scripture was true: 'They are shepherds feeding themselves; but my sheep they will not feed.' By their lax confessional morals they ruined the morals of princes and nations. The immorality in the courts of princes (Francis I, Louis XIV, August II of Saxony) they dared not reprove, content that by those the external power of the Church was promoted. It came to such a pass that they declared that every crime was permitted under certain circumstances. To themselves those popes gave splendid names. One called himself 'the pious' (Pius), another -the innocent' (Innocent), or 'the kind' (Clement). But in truth they were disturbers of the peace, consuming Europe's forces by strife and war, first by the centuries-long struggle they waged with the emperors, then by the Thirty Years' War unleashed by their ecclesiastical soldiers, the Jesuits, and by the most terrible weapon, those heretical tribunals of the Inquisition. Thus the Church suffered by her fault from the threefold wound: from the bloody persecution, worse than the first persecutions of Christians; from the perversion of doctrine; finally, by the establishment of the proposition, 'The end justifies the means,' from such a distressing undermining of truth and fidelity in the life and intercourse of men as perhaps not even the times of classical antiquity saw." From the encyclical of Pius X. that of the "E. K. Z." differs only in that Pius, like Janssen and Denifle, lies, but the "E. K. Z." communicates historical facts which could easily be multiplied almost ad infinitum. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. November 1910.** **No. 11.**

## Our Hymnal.

V. Revision of the song text.

In the report of the proceedings of the last Synod of Delegates it says: "The revision of the hymnal undertaken in the sixties of the past century is not considered to be a conclusive one, because at that time it was not yet possible to go back to the best hymnological sources for many hymns. Negotiations on the proposal of further revision are to take place at the next Synod of Delegates. Certain proposals are to be submitted to this by a committee. In the meantime, the members of the committee are to have occasional articles appear in "Doctrine and Weal," showing us what improvements are intended and may be called for."

In accordance with this decision, longer articles have already appeared in various issues of the aforementioned journal, in which the proposal is made and justified: 1. to correct and expand the literary-historical notes on the authors of the individual hymns and to add them to the hymnal in a special appendix; 2. to make necessary improvements to the melodies given in the hymnal; 3. to increase the number of hymns in our hymnal by a number of hymns. Thus, it may now be time to publish the proposals concerning the text of the hymns.

First of all, I would like to ask whether a revision of the texts of the hymns in our hymnal is at all necessary or desirable. Some will perhaps think that we could be quite content with our present texts. And indeed we could, if we wanted to keep something inferior, while we have the opportunity to get something better for it. But it is precisely the fact that our hymnal really does contain all kinds of deficiencies, some of them quite serious, that should induce us to be anxious to remedy them now that a revision of the book has been suggested.

has been brought. Why should not only many ugly printing errors, but also many metrical, linguistic and factual errors be dragged on from one edition of our hymnal to another, since they could now be so easily eliminated? Why should the many arbitrary, incorrect, even tasteless changes of the original text, which many a hymnal editor allowed himself in earlier times, be retained, while it is in our hands to put the original, better version in its place? But that our otherwise so excellent hymnal is in great need of revision in this respect, no one who has examined it carefully and without prejudice will be able to deny.

The points of view which should be kept in mind when determining the text of our hymns can be briefly summarized in the following words: The text of the hymns contained in our hymnal should be retained as faithfully as possible - except where the original is decidedly preferable - with the gentlest possible elimination of all forms of words and phrases which are incomprehensible and no longer correspond to the modern mode of expression.

From the outset, there can be no question of an absolutely exact, diplomatically faithful rendering of the original text of our hymns, since for some of them - admittedly only very few of them - there is no evidence at all of an original, neither in manuscript nor in the first printing. Therefore, one must be content with the text that the old hymnals and song collections offer us.

Another reason which makes the fixation of a certain original text almost impossible in many cases is the circumstance that some of our songs have different readings which, however, originate from the verse writer himself or were approved by him, even if only tacitly. This is especially true of Luther's hymns. As is well known, he had four hymnals published and provided each of them with a preface. The first appeared in 1524 under the title: "Geystliche gesangk Buchleyn. Wittemberg MDXXIIII" and is usually called the "Walthersche Chorgesangbüchlein", because Luther had consulted the cantor at the trousers of Frederick the Wise at Torgau, Johann Walther, in the arrangement of the songs for singing. In 1529 Luther organized the edition of a second hymnal under the title: "Geistliche Lieder auffs new gebessert zu Wittemberg. D. Mar. Luther MDXXIX Printed at Wittemberg by Joseph Klug. 1529." In 1542 appeared: "Christliche Geseng Lateinisch vnd Deudsch, zum Begrebnis. D. Martinus Luther. Wittemberg, Anno MDXLII. Printed by Joseph Klug." Three years after this Luther issued his fourth and last hymnal, usually called the Babstsche after the printer,

under the title: "Geistliche Lieder. With a new preface by D. Martin Luther." At the end of the book is the note: "Printed at Leipzig, by Valentin Babst in the Ritterstraßen MDXLV." The first of the above-mentioned books contains 24 Luther songs, the second the same and four new ones, the third süns already published, and the fourth, in addition to the 28 songs already printed earlier, eight newly composed ones. Unfortunately, however, the text of many of these songs is not always exactly the same. Thus, for example, in Walther's "Chorgesangbüchlein" the second line of verse of the first three stanzas of the song "Mit Fried' und Freud" (No. 65), as well as that of the fourth, consists of only four syllables (thus: in Gott's Wille - der treu' Heiland - mit groß' Gnaden - für die Heiden), while the later editions contain the reading of our hymnal. Likewise, in the hymn "Mitten wir im Leben sind" (416, str. 2, v. 7), according to Walther's Chorgesangbüchlein and Klug's hymnal of 1529, it says: "Es jammert dein' Barmherzigkeit unser' Klag' und große Leid," and only in Babst's hymnal of 1545 is the reading found: "unser' Sünd'". On the other hand, in the older editions of the hymn "Komm, Heiliger Geist" (134, 1, 5), it always says: "deines Lichtes Glast," but from the year 1535 on, it consistently says: "Glanz. Under such circumstances, there can be no question of a single specific original text.

It is similar with those of our songwriters who have subsequently changed the text of their songs themselves, as, for example, Johann Heermann has repeatedly rewritten his songs, so that many a variation, which one would be inclined to believe to be a later change by an unappointed hand, can be traced back to the poet himself. Thus, to cite only one example, in the song "O Gott, du frommer Gott" (281, 8, 1. 2) we find the following "original readings." When Thou on that day wilt raise the dead, so do - When Thou wilt raise the dead on that day, so do - Vnd when Thou at last wilt raise the dead, wilt Thou. Under these circumstances, which text is to be regarded as the "original" one, since all three readings originate from the author himself?

The matter is different, however, when different readings of the same hymn do not originate from the author, but from later arrangers or editors. Our hymnal contains a long series of hymns where this is true, e.g. 154, 194, 272, 374, 396, 402, 404, 408, 417 and many others. Here the question arises: Would it be wise to always return to the original? This question must be answered in the negative for several reasons. Indeed, a restoration of the original text would in many cases entail a transformation of the hymns which would only be disruptive; and why should one not approve of good readings which have been accepted for centuries by the whole Church? Also

cannot deny that some later versions are preferable to the original texts. For obvious reasons, for example, the following original versions had to be changed: 1, 3, 7: have mercy on us! Amen; 38, 3, 2: O my Orion, stay with me; 61, 4, 3: none of us is guilty; 82, 11, 3: his body is pus; 85, 10, 4: let my death-robe be; 141, 10, 1: protect the police, build the throne of our princes; 156, 4, 3: his date stands all on it; 179, 1, 2: the bad catechism teaching; 192, 11, 4: before letter of indulgence; 194, 6, 1: I am a man full of sin; 238, 6, 5: My soul, fly to heaven; 239, 5, 6: him I flee to with faith; 244, 5, 7: for excrement and filth only respect; 281, 7, 5-8: Give to the body, that it, where its parents grave, then also has its rest at their sides; 288, 2, 3: and queichelst him so tenderly; 407, 7, 1: a merry Urständ me verleih, u. a. m.

Now compare the versions of our hymnal with this, and one cannot help but call them well done. Especially metrical hardships have been eliminated many times later. There are also many examples of this in our hymnal. A completely faithful restoration of the original text would therefore in many cases not improve the song, but rather worsen it, at least according to today's point of view.

Another circumstance, which makes a return to the original text seem inadmissible in the case of many songs, arises from the melodies according to which they are now sung. First of all, the melodies of some songs have been adapted to later versions of the same, so that the original text, due to a lack or excess of syllables, could not be sung according to these melodies without alarming leaps, as for example in 37, 212, 292, 377, 410; or vice versa, some songs have been adapted later to other melodies, which resulted in the addition or omission of syllables or entire lines. Thus, for example, in each stanza of hymn 194, a line was deleted merely for the sake of the melody, while two syllables were always added to the stanzas of hymn 329 for the same reason. Then there are songs that were originally written continuously, but later, in order to make them singable, were divided into stanzas, which made all kinds of changes, or additions, necessary. This is the case, for example, with No. 142, where v. 4 and 5 of the 6th stanza, and with No. 334, where v. 3 and 4 of the 2nd stanza are to be regarded as later insertions.

Finally, some songs have been given a different verse division in order to make them more singable, whereby they have not infrequently suffered greatly through the tearing apart of what belonged together. Thus, for example, Song 352, which originally had twelve six-line verses, was later divided into eighteen four-line verses.

To refrain from a completely faithful reproduction of the original text, finally also the outdated writing and expression so

of many songs. We can no longer write: got, himel, gayft, heufflin, vnd, vvnser, ain (eyn), jn etc.. Also obsolete expressions such as: häubt, sunde, werlet, schon (= beautiful), für (= before), fast (= very) and the like can no longer be used here, since we are not dealing with a faithful copy of a literary-historical document, but with a church hymnal whose songs are not only to be read with the eyes, but also prayed and sung with the mouth. Therefore, such obsolete expressions must obviously be eliminated as gently as possible, even if the rhyme should be lost in the process.

An important model for such a change in the outdated form of expression is the (**sit venia verbo**!) "modernization" of our Catechism text. If we compare it with the older text as printed in Müller's Symbolic Books, we find, among other things, the following changes the following changes: sollt in sollst, über alle Ding in über alle Dinge, Nähesten in Nächsten, Waar in Waare, ihme in ihm, Gezeugnis in Zeugnis, entschüldigen in entschuldigen, eifiger in eifriger, fürchten für in fürchten vor, ich gläube in ich glaube, von der Jungfrauen in von der Jungfrau, protect us for in protect us from, comes in comes, happens in happens, forsake us our trespasses in forgive us our trespasses, he wills in he wills, dart in indeed, such petitions in such petitions, baptizes in baptizes, without in without, signifies in signifies, for God into before God, the other into the other, been into been, should be possible into should be possible, in peace into peace, grievance into grievance, forbear into forbear, give thanks into gave thanks, chief into chief, bless into bless, so-and-so into so-and-so, willt du in will du, mit gefalten Händen für den Tisch treten in mit gefallenen Händen vor den Tisch treten, fürstehen in vorstehen, schüchtern in schüchtern, Dienst für Augen in Dienst vor Augen, gegen ihnen in gegen sie, nu in nun, weibisch in weiblich, u. etc. Some ancient expressions have, of course, not been taken into account in this revision of the catechism text, such as to hell, by himself, vain punishment, indeed = forsooth, bad water, beweget = moved, schambar = shameless, and so on. If it was now permissible, indeed imperative, to make the text of the Catechism more understandable and palatable to the Lutheran people by such a quiet and gentle modification of the outmoded mode of expression, it is certainly not reprehensible, but rather absolutely necessary, to adapt also the text of our hymns, which are to be prayed and sung by young and old, of course as gently as possible, to the newer mode of expression. In addition to this, there is the circumstance that the Catechism is constantly explained linguistically and factually in school and church, but our hymns are never, or almost never, explained. A language that is easily understood by the common man is therefore evidently even more indispensable to the hymn than even to the catechism, especially in this country.

Now, most of the ancient word forms, while they can be

The songs can easily be exchanged for the corresponding newer ones, without the songs acquiring an essentially changed character; at most, the rhyme will suffer in some cases. Thus, in our hymnal, with damage to the rhyme, has already been changed, e.g. 36, 8: Praise be to God the Father thon (in g'than), Praise be to God seim eingen Sohn; 99, 2: Den Tod niemand zwingen kunnt . . . That makes all our sund (in sin); 183, 3: We believe in the Holy Spirit, God with Father and Son, Who is called the Comforter of all the foolish And with gifts graces schone (in beautiful), and the like. However, it is much more difficult to change expressions and phrases that have a completely different meaning today than in the old days, or that are no longer used at all. To the former belong e. g. B: eben (exactly), schier (soon), schlecht (straight, ordinary, low), sort (immediately and always), indeed (fürwahr), fast (very), noch (nevertheless), krank (weak), genesen (heil davonkommen), fristen (preserve, protect), police (state), Aufenthalt (refuge); to the latter: bekleiben (to stick, root), Susaninne (lullaby), meien (to reap), sich eräugen (to reveal oneself), bevorab (above all), Mott (mud, mustiness), etc. Etc. In most passages in which these incomprehensible and misleading expressions occur, one must therefore, in order not to change too much, take recourse to explanatory footnotes, or one could also add to the hymnal a list in which such expressions are explained, as is done in many Bible editions.

The Latin expressions that fortunately do not occur very often, such as **gratiosa coeli rosa, lilium, in dulci jubilo, cithara, musicam,** Gold Arabia, Kasia, etc., seem to be completely inappropriate and contradict the character of the Lutheran hymn as a spiritual folk song. Luther was averse to such learned finery is shown not only by his own example, but also by his letter to Georg Spalatin of 1524, in which he says: "I am willing to make German psalms for the people according to the example of the prophets and the old fathers of the church, namely, spiritual songs, so that the Word of God may also be preserved among the people through song. So we are looking for poets everywhere. Since you have both fullness and taste in German expression, and have developed both through much practice, I ask that you join hands with us in this and try to put any of the psalms into a song, as you have my example here. But I wanted the new and courtly words to be left out, so that the words might be said for the people in the simplest and most ordinary way, yet at the same time louder and more skilfully, and the meaning rendered clearly and entirely according to the Psalms."

Finally, it must also be pointed out that in our hymnal individual verses are sometimes omitted without good reason, sometimes

have been added. Thus, for example, stanzas 10 and 11 of hymn 152 can only be understood if the original eleventh stanza is placed between these two stanzas, namely, the words: "Thou shalt proclaim the salvation in which man shall partake, whose sin and iniquity the pious God hath forgiven" (out of heartfelt mercy, etc.). Likewise, it is almost inexplicable why the fourth stanza of the original, which is so beautiful, has been deleted from hymn 155: "Such a benefit is shown to those who ask for the Lord; the angels are inclined to them, to chase Satan away; therefore one may happily sing: Today is the day of the dear angels, who carry us into heaven." (Cf. also 306, 3 and 359, 7.) On the other hand, it is not evident why, for example, the seventh stanza, which comes from an unknown author, was added to the song of Paul Eber (No. 50), which is almost only an idle repetition and does not fit in at all with the preceding acrostic. The situation is similar with the two stanzas composed by Justus Jonas, which were added to the magnificent Luther hymn No. 159, but which actually disfigure it and should therefore be deleted. Luther himself has quite seriously forbidden all unauthorized "additions" and "additions" (if already to his Gesangbüchlein, then certainly also, even more so, to his hymns), when he writes in the preface to the Klugsche Gesangbuch, among other things: "Please and admonish me. Please and admonish all who love the pure word not to improve or increase such our little book Hinsort, without our knowledge and will; but if it would be improved without our knowledge, that one would know that it is not our little book issued in Wittemberg. Each of us may well compile his own booklet full of songs and leave ours alone, as we ask, desire, and herewith wish to have attested. For we also like to keep our coin in our dignity (= value), not begrudging anyone to make a better one for himself, so that God's name alone may be praised and our name not sought. Amen."

With consideration of the points of view outlined above, the Hymnal Commission undertook the revision of the hymn text entrusted to it. It had at its disposal not only a large number of old and new hymnals, but also a number of important hymnological writings, of which especially Phil. Wackernagel's extensive five-volume work on "Das deutsche Kirchenlied" and the no less excellent four-volume work, "Das deutsche evangelische Lied des 17. Jahrhunderts" by Fischer-Tümpel, deserve mention. With the help of this rich material, she repeatedly compared each song, each line, and even each word of our hymnal with the original texts and later adaptations, carefully examining and carefully considering them before deciding to make any changes to the text in our hymnal. Thus she has on the one hand in many places"

The German Academy of Music has restored the original text where it seemed necessary or desirable, and on the other hand, even though it resolutely rejects any arbitrary, unnecessary change, it has nevertheless dared to make slight alterations to the text when the comprehensibility of the expression, or the modern use of language, or an excessive metrical harshness seemed to make an alteration unavoidable, just as many things have been changed in our wonderful songs for centuries with the general consent of all.

In its work of revision, the Commission has also turned its attention to passages which seem to contradict pure doctrine or which are ambiguous. Just as in our hymnal a corrective note was rightly added to the words in 212:4: "Let me atone for this", so in other offensive passages (e.g. 30:6; 190:4; 202:9, 18, 19; 222:16; 258:10; 349:15; 391:4) the Commission believed it had to be careful to make slight changes to the original text, which was comprehensible. Likewise, she has also endeavored to improve the orthography and punctuation of the book according to the rules now in force.

With the humiliating awareness that, in spite of all the diligence put into it, it has only inadequately fulfilled its mandate, the Commission now announces the result of its text revision in the following list and takes the liberty of applying for the following amendments to the text of our hymnal with due modesty. At the same time, the Commission sincerely requests a thorough and careful examination of the proposals made and the prompt communication of any expositions, so that they may be duly considered before the next Synod of Delegates convenes.

Comments. - The amendments marked with an asterisk (*) seem to the Commission to be very desirable, but not of the same importance as those not marked with an asterisk.

The accompanying note (O.) usually refers to the original text, but sometimes to a very old reading.

The remark "so throughout" means that linguistic hardships of the same kind which occur again later (such as for instead of before, when instead of if, him instead of himself, shall instead of shallst, seind instead of are, schon instead of schön, Trauren instead of Trauern, unser instead of unsre etc.) have not always been noted again.

Some footnotes, which may seem superfluous, are added primarily for the sake of the children, who also use the hymnal.

Some of the proposed changes only become fully understandable when the requested change in punctuation is taken into account.

Since Fr. Schlerf was unable to participate in the text revision due to his move to Denver, this article appears without his signature, and thus only the undersigned are responsible for it.

Otto Hattstädt. Aug. Crull.

## List of proposed changes.

No. 1, stanza 1, v. 4: a pity. (Original.) 1, 2, 2: Ehr', we thank. (O.) 1, 2, 6: g'schieht (so throughout, except where the rhyme forbids it). 1,4,3: before's (so throughout, if - before the). 1,4, 7: from it we. (O.) 2,4,2: thou richer. (O.) *3,2,3: all together. 4,1,3: with love and grace. (O.) *5,2, 3: is it, that. (O.) 6,1-18: Halleluja is to be deleted for the sake of the melody (HErr Gott, dich loben alle wir). *6, 1, 3: do not do your weekly work. (O.) 6,9,1: He is risen (*bright and clear). (O.) 6,10,3: would be insured. (O.) 6,11,4: and say this. (O.) 6,15,3: and we ourselves. (O.) *8,2,2: verhüllet. (O.) 8,2,5: think, do, and write good. (O.) *8,4,1: Father, Son and Holy Spirit (so throughout). *9,1,6: because he feeds us so gloriously. (O.) 9, 2, 6: fully prepared. (O.) (Note: 1 Petr. 5, 10.) 10, 2, 2: to honor himself (so throughout, if reflexive). *10, 3, 4: to good pasture. (O.) 11,5: in this. 13,1, 6: before all things (so throughout, when for - before, also in compounds). 13,2,6: highly consoled. (O.) 13,3,4: comes (consistently without umlaut). *13,5,4: the risers make him right. 13,6,3: because us together. *13,8,3: the, so. *13,11,1: they, so. 13,12, 5: we want together. 14,3,5: in the kingdom of honor. 14,4,4: now given. 14,5,2: the heavenly leniencies. (O.) *14, 6, 5: our throne of grace. 14, 7, 3: plain. 14, 7, 8: may. (O.) 14, 8, 1: merciful (-igs throughout -ig or -'ges). 14, 9,5: if (so throughout, if temporal conjunction). 15,1,1: beautiful (so throughout). 15,1,2: Mary's (so throughout). 15,2,1: blessed. 15, 5, 2: before. 15, 6,2: manger (so throughout). 16, 2,8: in great number. (O.) 16,4,3: the golden crown. 16,5,6: the saints all at once. *16,6,7: bronze. (O.) 16,7,2: from all misery. (O.) 16,7,5: mourning (so throughout). 17,3,1: like the. 17,3,8: laid. *18,1,10: Christ is the sun of grace (so throughout in n. 18 and 104). 18,3,4: O let. (O.) *18,4,2: further also in graces an. 20,5,1: before the order of men. 20,5,6: our burden (so throughout). *20,6,8: salvation and peace. (O.) 20,7,5: o dear brothers. 20,10,5: here (so throughout, except when the rhyme calls for here). 20,11,5: all good gifts. 20,11,7: since ye shall. (O.) 21,2,4: the eternal good (so throughout). 21,6,3: make rich. 22,5,1: clothe (note: adhere, root). 22,7,1: from there he will. 22,8,5: where they. (O.) *22,9,2: b'reite our heart to. 22,9,4: rightly believing. 23,3,2: the virgin's son (so throughout). 23,6,1: thy coming. 23,6,2: danger (note: guile, falsehood). 23, 7, 4: too high for me misses (note: for me weak too presumptuous auftrrtt). 23, 8, 1: the head of the snake. 23, 8, 2: of all fears free. 23, 9,4: just before you. *24,1,6: his splendour is afar off. 24, 5, 3: kill the old man. 25,4,4: divide into a thousand pieces (so throughout). 26,1,2: all the saints hope. (O.) *26,1,3: thou Saviour. (O.) 26,1, 5: in ancestral adornment. 26, 2, 6: that thou. (O.) *26, 3, 5: and thy holy merit. (O.) 29, 3, 4: can thank enough. 29,4,2: a creature. (O.) 29,6,3: b'may (so throughout, if may - need). 29,10,2: arrival. 29,11,3: even for (note: exactly before). 29,12,1: arrival in the world. 29,12,3: the other (so throughout). 30,3,1: all his power. (O.) 30,6,4: the clearness of God (note: Phil. 3, 21). 30,7,4: the heart of Jesus. 31,1,8: of counsel! (O.) 31,4, 3: put up. (O.) 32,1,1 u. 5,1: even (note: exactly). 32,1,3: why God gave his Son, g. (O.) 32,2 u. 3: teach - teach - die - acquire - may'. *32,2,5: grace acquire thee. 32,7,2: thy rule (note: guide and lead thee). 32,9,2: sheer (note: soon). *32,9,4: to the eternal. 32,11,6: at the longest. 32,13,5: with him fine diligence do. (Note: in fellowship with Christ is diligent to good works). 32,13, 6: for. *32,15, 2: b'reit' thy poor people to. 35, 3, 3: that let us remain. 36,1,3: that sore. (O.) 36,2,1: of flesh. (O.) 36,2,4: blossoms a' fruit of woman's flesh (Note: blossoms as a fruit of Mary's flesh). 36:6:4: containing sick flesh (note: preserving our weak flesh against our enemies; cf. 209:2). 38, 2, 1: self (so throughout). 38, 3,4: moisten. (O.) 39:9,6: anxiety and fear. (O.) *39,15,3: abide thee! (O.) 40,1,3: break in there. (O.) 40,1,4: all stars shine. 40,5,3: have set. (O.) 40,6,4: this is now granted to us by God. *40,8,4: there now rests the virgin child. 40,10, 3: so already in the beginning. *40,14,4: the princes of life are met here. (O.) 41,7,2: What lies in. (41,7,3: What is... (O.) *41,8,1: Be welcome to me, noble guest! 41,14,3: Susaninne beautiful (note: lullaby, slumber song). 41,15,4: such new year. 43,

2,3: sank into the bottom of hell. 43,2,4: could' (so throughout). *43,9,1.2: although what their heart desired was not granted them in the flesh. 44,1, 6: set the torch to me (note: enlighten me). 44, 6,2: highly afflicted. (O.) 44, 8,7: to comfort and true salvation. (O.) 44, 9,8: are (so throughout). *45,4, 5,6: of sins burden and infallible burden. 48,1,3: in all. 48,4,3: no sin. (O.) 48,4,4: new year. 50,1,3: other wise. 50,1,6: the year ended. 50,1,7: turns. 50,1,8: the new year has come. 50,2,1: seriously. (O.) 50,2,7: of this life. (50,3,3: for young and old. *50,3,5: with even mild. 50,4,5: more equal (note: more just, more appropriate). 50, 6,6: a merry year. (O.) *50,7,1-8: to be deleted, because spurious and superfluous. 51,3,6: in the bottom of the heart. (O.) 52,2,1: grace. 52,2,3: pity. *52, 3,4: fear and trembling. (O.) *52,4, 6: and him yes with nothing. (52,4,7: that I am still here... (O.) *52,5,3: always carry me out of my hands. (O.) 52,5,6: also leave. (O.) 53:5,2: to ransom (cf. 56:3). 53:10:1: by day and by night. 53,10,2: to drow (so throughout). 57,1,5: afar off (cf. 271, 1. 2 and 443, 5. 8). *58,4,6: with praising and with singing! (O.) 59,4,7: in peace (O.) (so throughout). 62,4,4: when. *63,2,7: as what to me. (O. that.) 63,5,1: then. (O.) 64,3,1: in delight. (O.) *64,6,4: not knowing thee. (65,2,4: and made. 65,2,5: the life (mine) and 4,2: for falls die Heiden (since verse measure and melody demand one syllable more). *67, 5, 2: the scepter (so throughout). *67, 9, 7: the never to be. (O.) *67, 12, 4: the strongest. (O.) 70, 2,5: to commit sin out of error. (O.) 72, 1,3: corpse (note: body). 73, 1,5: sick (mark: weak). 73, 1,6: pardon himself (note: renounce). 73,7,5: away with the treasures of this world. *73,7,6: and all that pleases the flesh! 73,9,5: of melancholy. 73,10,6: before the throne. (O.) 73,10,8: entrusted. 74,2,7: before distant m. 74,3,7: let mercy be given for justice! *74,5,1: out of gratitude. 74,5,4: you will take me there in the future. (O.) *75,6,2: to the crown. *75,9,2: wherewith yet. *75,11, 2: to fasten firmly the desires to the cross. 75,12,2: out of love for you to consider the world as nothing. (75,14,1: though it be small. 77,4,2: strength. (77,4,4: new lifeblood. (77,6,8: then. 78,5,1: roses of joy. (O.) 78,6,6: Satan's pranks. 78, 9,5: enjoy (note: have benefit of). 79, 5, 2: to deliver me from chastisement. 80,3,4: what. 80,4,2: forbid (note: make good by praying). 80,4,4: vernimmet (note: feels). 80,6,2: lead. (O.) 80,9,3: spie. 80,9,4: vernicht'te (note: respected for nothing). 80,10,3: last, when already . . . machet'. (O.) 80,12,2: with selb'ger. 81,3,2.4: hell - fall of man. *81,3,6: let grace find thee. 81, 5, 2: shall (so throughout, except where rhyme forbids). 81,8,3: ought. (O.) 81,8,4: divorced. *81,9,3: my heart's comfort and portion. (81,9,4: to remain eternally faithful to you. (O.) *81,10,6: that which offends thee shall. (O.) 81,14,6: to God. (O.) 81,15,5: me's. (O-) 82,2,3: argen. (O.) 82,3,2: stands for. (O-) 82,6,3: vain glory. (O.) 82, 7,1: Thine ear letteth itself. 82,7,2: Jews. 82,15,2: was. (O.) 82,16,3: the same. (O.) *83,1,2: so smitten. (O.) 83,1,6: gang distress. (O.) 83,4,8: sinner's part. (O.) 83, 7, 6: cross, anguish, and chastisement. (O.) 84, 7,2: come h. w. me (note: do h. w. me). *85, 2, 4: thou hast thy, (O.) 85, 10, 3: grave cloths. *85,11, 2: behold, O Lord, the election of grace. 85,11, 4: geleit'. (O.) 88,2,2: lies dead. (O.) 89,5,4: band. 89,6,3: heavier. 89,9,5: lay (note: use on). *90,4,5: for mine. (O.) *90,5,5: ah, show me the strength. (O.) 90,6,4: nothing what. (O.) 91, 2,4: foot and nail marks'. 92, 1.3.5: the sinner (instead of: the soul). 93, 3.1: sojourn (note: refuge). 94, 2.4: his servant. (O.) 96,3: Son of God today's cover. 98,1,1: all. (O.) 99,1,1: in death's bands. 99, 3, 6: Death's form. *99.6.1: this high feast. (O-) 99,7,2: Easter cake (Note: flat Easter cake). 100,7,4: that we. (O.) 101, 2,5: the enemies' multitude. 103,4,3: his' sweat cloth. (103,6,2: with two. (103,7,4: he lays. 103,9,2: g'wann an him (note: gained the upper hand over him). 103,13,4: world prince. *104,1-^,10: Christ is the sun of grace. *104,4, 2: further also in graces. 105,1-19: Because of the melody, "Erschienen ist der herrlich' Tag," the middle Hallelujahs and one of the last in each stanza are to be deleted. *105,3,3: On the third. (O.) 105,7,3: plain. *105,8,1: wholly knowable. (O.) *105,9,4: crushed. (O.) 105,13,2: dare to take hold of it (Note: take hold of it with his help). 105,17,4: turned away. 105,19,3: with greater. *106,1,2: joyful time come. (O.) *106,4,2:

my heart in loud. (O.) 107,2,2: devastates him all' G. (O.) 107,4,2: danger. *107,5,1-4: to be deleted, because inserted and stnndisturbing. 107,6,1: all at once. (O.) 107,6,3: all'n. (O.) 107,6,4: sound. (108,5,3: because you. 109,7,1: then. (O.) 110,1,1: JEsus Christ, our Saviour. (O.: Enchiridion and Walther.) 110,2,4: God us. (O.: E. u. W.) 110,3,1: und auch Gnad'. (O.: E. u. W.) 111, 1,3: sollt'. (O.) 111,3,4: him. 111, 8,5: Trumpet'. 112, 10,3: now. (O.); cf. str. 1. 113,5,2: ye may. (O.) 114,3,3: of sins distress. (O.) 114,4,12: won. (O.) 114,5,7.8: the joy of blessedness. (O.) 115,1,1: want (so throughout). 115,2,4: dear of heart. (O.) 115,4,4: seduced. (O.) 115,5,1: especially from. *116,3,12: honoring you as the victor. (O.) 116,4,4: do and change (O.); cf. 120,11, 5. 116,6,7: sheer (note: soon). 117,2,3: gab'n. *117,2,7: very demanded. (O.) 118,1,3: highest greed. 118,1,7: hab'n (so throughout, except where rhyme forbids). 118,3,7: bad (note: even). *118.4.1: catch. *120,8,3: us. *120,8,6: like nothing but you us. (O.) 120,9,6: of thy delight. (120,10,2: like them. 120,10,4: not even outside. *120, 10, 5: limbs. (O.) 120, 12, 3: but there. *121, 2, 6: lautern. (122, 13, 4: choir. (O.) 123,3,1: he is gone. 123, 4, 1: raises (note: raised). 123, 5,4: of Mary. *123,7,2: only fresh. (125,2,2: dearest of all. 125, 3,1: whereas that. 126,2,2: to preach God's W. 127,1,4: difference. 127,2,1: had before. 127,2,4: to teach in all things. 127,3,1: He said to them. 127,3,3: He will certainly teach you. 127,4,1: Therefore, if. *128,2,1: He let reveal. (O.) *128,2,2: As our highest refuge. (O.) *128,2,3: To us who were fools. (O.) 128,3,7: thine. (O.) 130,3,6: out of us all. 130,5,6: to lay themselves in ashes! (Note: perish.) 130,7,5: God's spirit. (O.) 130,8,5: is he that. (O.) 130,9,4: and makes. (O.) 130,11,5: and makes it. 130,12,6: and makes it. 130,14,3: stand down (note: pass away). 130,15,2: this guest the H. 131,3,6: come, Brunn, net me. (O.) 131,3,8: come, oil, and give me. (O.) *131,4,1: leave me in no distress. (O.) *131,4,2: give heavenly desire. (O.) 131,5, 2: sins. (O.) 131,7, 9: before thine. (O.: for.) 132,1,4: who are thy' creatures before! (Note: according to the Latin original = fill with heavenly grace the hearts which thou hast made!) 132,6,4: understand. 132,7,3: done. *134,1,5: shine. (O. since 1535.) 135,1,6: the dark. (O.) *135,2,4: as what. (O.) *135,2,6: of error. (O.) 135,3, 2: that which Against thee. 135, 3, 4: be our course. *135, 5, 6: increased. (O.) 135,6,1: us also. (O.) 135,6,4: make us the B. (O.) (Note: make an end of our anguish.) 135,9,5: erkiest (Note: has chosen). 136,1,4: wretched (note: strangers). *138,4,1: divide us thy grace all the hours. (O.) 139,2,4: to JEsu Christ. (O.) 140,3,5: also others in Chr. (O.) 140,4,6: we now. 140,6,6: pure ones. 140,7,10-12: pure love thou wilt give, meekness and humility also beside. (O.) 140,8,1: Help that in true. (O.) 140,8,4-6: Be well aware how vain is the lust of the flesh and its works of sin! (O.) 140,8,9: our mind. (O.) 140,8,10: until we. (O.) 141,6,2: nothing. 141,9,5: before. *141,10,1-4: rule the authorities from thy heavenly throne, let thy hand guide them; adorn, as with a crown, (O.). 141,10, 6-8: with piety the youth (O.), with godliness and virtue (O.) the people.throughout the land! (O.) 142,2,2: with all B'gier. *144,4,3: whom all things praise and extol, (O.). 144,4,4: which in the air. (O.) 145,3,1: Holy Spirit, who. 147,4: filled. 148,1,5: for cheap. (O.) 148,2,4: people and land (O.); cf. 149,8. 148,4,4: remain'! 149,2,4: revealed given. (O.) 149,5,3: all sin. (O.) 149,9,2: our sense. (O.) 149,10,3: and afterwards also. *149,11,1: we thank thee and ask thee. (149,11,2: that it may be so. (O.) 149,11,3: with sighing. (O.: for S.) 150,2,5: God of Abraham, . . . Isaac, . . . Jacob's. 150,3,4: shown himself. 150,5,3: brings you rest. (O.) 150,5,7: which here is no ear. (150,8,3: in time. *152, 3,1: Since with us already was. (O.) 152, 4,1: like us. 152, 5, 3: he would break. (O.) 152, 8, 3: served. 152, 11, 1-4: Between c. 10 and 12 the following, necessary c. is missing: Thou shalt proclaim salvation, in which man shall have part, whose sin and iniquity the pious God hath forgiven. (O.) Cf. Luk. 1, 77. 152,12,2: whose. 153,2,2: a' burden. 153,3,2: all this. (O.) 154,1,3: because you. 154,4,1: in general. 154,4,4: great danger. (154,5,2: before your hand...

may not. (O.) 154,5,4: dem hast. (O.) *154,6,4: that goes all the time. (O.) *154,7,3: and make him a prince. (O.) 154,7,4: the rich poor, the. (O.) 154,11,2: trinity (so throughout, except 168,1; 303,1). 155,4: The following 4th str. of the original is unlawfully omitted, and should be added again: Such a benefit is shown to those who ask for the Lord; the angels are inclined to them, to chase Satan away; wherefore one may cheerfully sing, To-day is the day of the dear angels, who carry us to heaven. 156, 1, 4: hovering before thine. *156, 3, 3: that they may be around thee, O Lord God. (156,5,1: he brought them before. 156,4 and 5: the stanzas are shifted; 4,1.2; 5,1.2-4,3. 4; 5, 3. 4. 156, 9,1: likewise also. 156,10,1: to-day. 156,10,2: and many a one. (O.) 156,11,4: praise. (O.) 156,12,4: which holdeth thy divine word in value. (O.) 157,2,7: thrust and hurt. (O.) 157,4,1: peculiar. *157,4,7: high benefit. (O.) 157,5,5: and the authorities. 159,1, 4: want. (O.) 159,4 u. 5: to be deleted, because inappropriate addition. 160,2,4: to helpers. 160,4,2: hatt' Eigenwitz. 160,4,3: always. 160,5,7: difference. 160,9,5: in peace. (O.) 160,11,1: also convert'. 160,11, 2: the wrong way. *160,11,6: may hinder. (O.) 161,3,4: trust. 161,3,7: in Christ. 161,4,3: wholly out of sincerity. (O.) 161,4,11: geg'n (O.) you. 161,5,7: bad (note: badly, simply). 161, 6,10: kehr'n sie nicht. 161, 7, 4: for thou hast us. 161,7,11: deny me not. 161,8,7: already. 162,1,4: have to. 163,3,10: will. (163,4,9: to the end. (164,6,5: beheaded. *164,8,1: later. 164,9,5: yet another. 164,11,1: recognized. *164,11,4: embers of fire nor sword. 164,11,6: could. *164,13,2: O Lord God, mercifully. 164,14,4: trust, O Lord, in you, 164,14,5: as also love. 165, 3,4: grant that it. (O.) *165,5,3: great' rapture. (O.) 166,1,5: one does not let. (166,2,2: self-will. 166,3,1: want . . . Teach'. 166,6,4: braid (note: sich menge, mische). 166, 6, 6: loosen. 167, 3, 2: of the authorities. 168,1,4: stehet. *168,9,3: "last", afflicted. 169,2,8: eternal. (O.) 169,3,4: out of those who are illumined. 169,4,4: as thou, o. 169,6,5: of the dew of heaven. (O.) 170,1,5: indeed (note: forsooth!). 170,2,2: children. 170,3,5: it did her'r. 170, 6,4: Gesangnen. *171,1,1: may God have mercy on us. 171,1,6: what is dear to him (note: pleasing, dear). 171,3,5.6: bless. *172,1.2.3: give - let - give. *174,1.4: by thine. (O.) *175, 2,1: fill with that. (O.) 176,5,2: make a mockery of. 177,1,3: no other. 178,3,3: Holy Spirit. (O.) 178, 6,1: By the way the seed is immediately. (O.) 178,7,2: the good, fruitful land. (O.) 178,8,1: as long as we. (O.) *178,10,7: faith, love, patience and hope! (179,2,4: beautiful. 180,1, 3: Moses. 180, 4, 1: seventh. *180, 8,2: sweat and blood. (O.) 181, 3, 1: beautiful. 182, 9,2: always turned to the best. (O.: away - evermore.) 182,10,1: right-appearance. 182,11,1: zealous God. (O.) 182,11, 4: third' and fourth. (O.) 182,12,4: above all lust and treasure. (O.) *182,14, 3: the crown. 182, 20: The following final verse of the original should be restituted: God the Father, help from your throne, help, O Lord JEsu, Son of God, help, Holy Spirit, and strengthen me to serve you willingly! Kyrieleis! *184,3,1: to the Holy Spirit. (Cf. 183, 3,1.) 185,2,2: Sanctified. 185,2,5: Protect us, Lord, from. (O.) 185,4,3: Give us patience. (O.) 185,6,2: deceive. 185,8,3: from eternal death. 186,2,4: heresy. (186,3,7: his teachings. (187,4,2: all of them. (O.) 187, 6, 3: once decided. *187, 10, 1: not a bad one. (O.) 188, 8, 6: renew. 189, 3: which we. 190, 1, 1: we are here. (O.) 190,2,2: in our ears. (O.) 190,4,3: now in this flood. *190,4,6: to clothe oneself entirely in thee! 190,7,2: from the heart. (O.) 191,2,1: reason of heart (O.) (so throughout). 191,2, 4: Kindsstatt. 191,4,2: woll'. (O.) 191,5,2: all his. (O.) 191,5,5: now (so throughout). 191,5,7: and those. (O.) *191,6,4: me always. (O.) *191,7,5: as thy child devil's works hate'. (O.) *191, 7, 7: never will. (192, 6,1: confessor (also 8, 1 and 193, 2, 1). 192, 10, 2. 3: the sin torments, that he almost despairs, who keeps. (O.) *193,1,4: help us in body and soul. (O.) 193,2,3: go in peace. (194,2,5: I am indeed. 194,3,1: Bread of heaven. *194,3,7: but let me. (O.) 194,5,5: comforts. (O.) *194,8,5: thou abidest in me. (O.) 195,1, 5: corpse (note: body). 195,2, 6: I today yes worthy. (O.) 195,3, 6: keep right measure (Note: do what is according to your will). 196,3,3: treasure and shepherd come back, (O.). 196,4,7: after that. (O.) *197,5,7: stand by me. (O.) 197,7,4: refresh. *198,2,5: to thee. (198,3,2: to-

ignite. (O.) 198,3,6: sin. (O.) 198,4,6: clean and dissected. (O.) *198, 6,1: to thee in grace. *198, 8,1: come, my joy, come. (O.) *199, 2,4: that he. (O.) *199, 2, 5: still his N. (O.) 199, 3, 4: and out of it. 200, 5, 9: of the tribulation. 201,2,6: that I may find grace again. (O.) 201,3, 6: therefore have with me. (O.) 201, 5: From it I will receive with faithful desire the true body and blood, which was given for me; help that it may be my life and my soul's eternal good! (O.) 202,5,1: from. (O.) 202,10,4: the dying of the. 202,11,4: then. (O.) 202,9.18.19: should, because factually incorrect, either be deleted, or instead of the 9th st. the 15th st. of the original, for instance, could be placed: There thou stirest up to my mouth the manna, which thou art thyself. O pleasant hour of joy! How good thou art, O Lord Christ! Instead of 18:1: Thou wilt make me one; instead of 19:4: Thou Thyself, who makest me. 203:1,5: Hereby. (O.) 203,3,1: because it is necessary. (O.) 203,8,5: compare (note: balance, explain). 203,11,2: not late. (O.) 205,5,2: that's. 205,6,2: labor (note: toil, trouble). 205,8,1: können'n. 205,8,2: may'. 205,10, 4: hath in thee. (O.: Ench. u. Walther.) 206,3,4: wedding dress. 206, 6, 2: o JEsu. *206, 9, 3: guilt of sin. (O.) 206,10,3: I lead. (O.) 206,10,4: make firm. (O.) 207,2,3: these dear ones. 207,3,1: thank you enough. 207,9,2: that I still find in me. 208,1,2: the lost. 208,3,3: like one. 209, 2, 2: and [he] the joyful spirit, obtain. 210, 2,5: the gates of the spirit. (O.) 210, 3, 7: blood-filled (O.) bowl. 210, 8, 1: thy faithful. (O.) 210,9,8: thy guest. (O.) 212,2,3: end. (212,3,4: reconciled. (O.) 212,6,2: by thy'. 212,6,4: separated. 212,7 u. 8: should be deleted, because interfering interpolations. 213,1, 6: is no. (O.) 213,1, 9: hab'. *213,2,9: that which thou mayest look upon me. 213,3,4: may intimately. 213,3,8: to behold. 213,4,3: a son. (O.) 213,4,9: and follow him in. (O.) 214,1, 4: open. 214,1, 6: is done (as in the large and small editions of the hymnal). 214, 2, 7: grace. 214, 5, 2: grace. 214, 5, 4: pity. 215, 1, 4: thy grace's feet. 215, 6, 6: such. (O.) 215, 7, 4: all poor. *215,10,3: that now thou mayest soon have the crown of grace. *215,10,4: in heaven will give us. 216,2,5: before great (O.: for). 216,2,6: in my sins. (O.) 216, 2, 7: and forever. (O.) 216, 3,3: from that. (O.) *216,6,1: So also I come to thee all here. (O.) *216,6,2: of my fear. (O.) *216,6,5: I pray thee, forgive me. *216,7,1: O Lord, forgive, forgive. (O.) *216, 8,6: right faith of. (O.) 217, 5, 4: about that. *217, 6, 1: found the grace of. *217, 6, 5: nor also I. (O.) *218,2,3: Help me, that I may again. (O.) *218,3,1: Hear, oh hear. (O.) 218,5,3: Alas, alas, mercy, mercy! (O.) *218, 5,4: I will not leave thee. (O.) *218,6,4: recognize me again for your child! (O.) 219, 11, 2: the dwelling of thy love. 220, 8,4: not to her. 220, 8,5: yet so. (O.) 220,15,5: carnality. 220,16,3: your spirit's love compulsion. (221,1,3: darker. *221,1,8: O Lord. (O.) 221,7,5: subject. 221,9,7: to mine. (O.) 221,11,6: none ever. (O.) 221,11,8: full of faith. (O.) 221,12,2: perish. (O.) 222,5,4: grace and. (O.) *223,7: cry woe. (O.) 224, 6, 5: from. (O.) 224, 7,2: be thou. *225, 5, 6: (oh let it go to your heart! [O.]) 227,1,4: fail me not. *227,2,6: oh let me find grace! 227,3,1.2: my heart, forsooth! is whole. *227, 7,3: yes already. *227, 7, 5: me grace. 227, 11, 2: HErr, for and for. 228, 3, 4: reject (note: turn away). 228,4, 4: sins. (O.) *228,4,5: so look upon me in grace. 228,6,3: my excrement of sins. (O.) 228,9,3: falls (note: overwhelms). 228,10, 5: difference. 228,10, 6: night time and day time. (O.) 228, 11,5,6: guilt, by his' patience. (O.) 228,12,3: his' meekness. (O.) 231, 2, 6: without hypocrisy. 231,4,3: nothing shall. *234, 1, 6: heaven mine. (O.) *234, 6, 5: but his grace does not concern him who. (O.) 235, 6, 3: you. 236, 1,9 u. 2,2: Eva. 236,3,6: ew'gen. 236, 9, 2: alfalfa (note: light). 237, 4,4: doch mehrt'. 237,5,1: yet must'. 237,5,5: whole G'setz (cf. 2,1. 6; 3.2; 5,1; 9,1.6). 237,9,3: Gospel (four syllables). 237,10,1: the works k. (cf.10, 6; O.: work', which). 237,11,3: when (O.) ... for joy'. 237,11,5: when's. (O.) 237,14,4: will spare us from our guilt. (O.) 237,14, 6: stand. 238,2,6: this. (O.) 238,5,2: henceforth. 238,7,4: I can. (O.) 240,6,4: ausgetan (note: extinguished like a light). 240,7,5: I through it. 242,3,7: sunk by his death and blood. (O.) 242,3,8: and given them God's Spirit, (O.). 242,3,9: who can joyfully cry Abba! (O.) *242,4,4: to

everlasting. (O.) *242,4,5: from in child's stead. (O.) *242, 5, 8: the stream of bitter tears of remorse. 242, 5, 9: no more what she did. (O.) *242, 9,8: shall yet have mercy. 243,1,1: dear Christians g'mein (note: insgemein). 243,1, 3: all' in one (note: all together). 243, 2, 2: in death. (O.) 243, 2, 3: tormented. 243, 3, 1: galten. 243, 3, 3: hated. 243,4,1: lamented'. (O.) 243,10,7: to the last. (O.) 244,1, 6: the true faith me. 244,3, 2: the true'. 244,7,4: rule (note: act, conduct myself). 244,10,7: follow'. (O.) 246,1,7: of my sin. (O.) *246,3,7: and acquired salvation for me. (O.) *246,5,7: who sat in faith. (O.) 247,1, 3: of the false world tumult. 247,3,3: then. 247,4,6 u. 5,6: My JEsus is the best friend. (O.) Cf. st. 1.2.3. 6. 251,2,1.2: yours - before the. (O.) 251, 6,9: you too. (O.) 252, 3 u. 4: the 3rd st. should be the 4th st., but the 4th st. the 3rd st. (O.) 254, 3,4: mich gedenket. (O.) 254,4, 6: tilg'all deine. (O.) 254, 6, 3: andres. (O.) 255, 2, 2: because I shall (note: as long as I shall). 255, 5, 2: and yearn. (O.) 255, 6, 3: Christ will. *256, 3, 3: if this stands, nothing can arise. (O.) 256, 3, 5: other. 256,4, 3: this' noble glow. (O.) 256,10,4: to thee have I given myself. (O.) 256,11, 8. 9: the pains that . . . make. *257,1, 2: and my throne of grace. *257,7,4: loving. (O.) 258,2,1: the joy of the heart. (O.) 258,4,3: Gnadenbronn. (O.) 258, 6, 4: felt. *258,10,1-4: In whatever place I am, I always look for Jesus; how happy when I find him! How blessed when I hold him! 258,11,2: Desire. 258,11,3: with love. (O.) 258,13,4: an end never. 258,15,4: glory (two syllables). *258,16,4: has God satisfied for us. (O.) 258,17,2: all' sense and courage. (O.) 258,19,2: not. 260,7,6: Friedendefürst (as in the large and small editions of the hymnal). 261,1,3: the sweet W. J.! (O.) 261,2,3: ver'r. 261,2,4: thee the fairest flower'. 261,3,2: o thou my bright gem. 261,3,9.10: spotless rose of heaven. 261, 6,1: strings to sweet sound. 261, 6,2: let the high song of praise. 262,1,3: the caves of gloom. 262,3,1: of Moses. 262,3,5: wound. 264,7,4: give her a kiss of love. (O.) 265,5,4: against me. 267, **4,** 5: pushes. *267, 5, 5. 6: do'; give me strength and courage to do it! *269, 2, 4: and help me graciously. 269, 4, 3: my v. (O.) 269, 7, 5: all my senses. *270, 3, 1: shall I then (O.) once according to thy counsel. *270, 3, 3: grant me, O Lord, only. (O.) *272, 5, 3: my' hope, which wavereth not from thee; (O.). *272,5,4: constancy is best. (O.) 272,5,10: unstained by lechery. (O.) 272,6,4: become new again. (O.) 273,2,5: especially when. 273,2,8: on all your own doing (for the sake of melody). 273,3, 8: breaks in. 273,4, 8: your favor. 273, 5, 8: danger. 274,16,1: even wild. 274,16,3: joyful. (O.) 275,4,3: thy patience. (O.) 276,1,3: very loaded. 276,1,5: have. *276,2,1: light my burden; *276, 2,2: he that believeth after me shall. *276,2,3: will surely escape from hell; 276,3,1: what I have done. 276,4,4: yet may it not. 276,4,5: therefore only surrender therein. 276,5,3: end it. 276,6,2-4: and tomorrow he will be fatally ill, and soon he must die altogether. Like the flowers of the field. 276,7,3: this May (note: May, flowering time). 276,7,4: one would have. (O.) 276, 7, 6: the rows (note: death dance - die). 276, 8,4: not ready't. 276, 8, 5: the time of grace. 276,12, 3: only ape! (O.) 276,12, 5: always goes along. 276,12,6: already punish. (O.) 276,13,2: in favor and g'sund with. (O.) 276,14,6: and can. 276,15,5: glory (two syllables). The order of the stanzas of Schumann's text: 1-6. 9.10. 7. 8.11-16. 277, 2, 3: none at all. 277, 3, 8: and then. *277,10, 4: but by grace. 277,11, 3: reconcile. 278,2, 6: comfort with G. 279,1, 6: Satan's cunning. (O.) "279,2,3: otherwise on it. 279, 3, 3: wake up, else. 279,4, 5: and God. (O.) 279, 6, 7: pretend soon (note: pretend). 281, 5, 3: as far as it. (O.) 281, 8, 2: awaken. (O.) 282, 4, 2: to overcome. 283,2,4: say the. (O.) 283,2,5: who closed. 283,2,6: not again from thy God! (O.) 283,4,4: in woe. (O.) *283, 5,4-8: to be deleted. *283, 6, 1-4: to be deleted. 283, 6, 5: he is. (O.) 283, 6, 6: against you. 283,8,7: good way. (O.) *284, 2, 1, 2: let no wind of the cross thee. (O.) *284,8,2: shall he prove thee. (O.) 285,5,3: and if. (O.) *285, 6, 3: she might well for it. (O.) 285, 6,4: nor even give heaven. (O.) *285,6,6: nothing holds. (O.) *285,7,4: not the power of death. (O.) *285,8,2: only JEsus. (O.) 285,8,3: my treasure, my honor and glory. (O.) 285, 8, 4: and my lust beside. (O.) 287,1,8: enraged. 287, 2, 2: proved. 287,5,2: pointed out. 287,5,4: for which, O Lord, be praised. *287,

8,6: govern me always. (O.) 288, 10,6: so that she could not heal anything else. 289, 6,4: she counsels the common (Note: helps that the common benefit take good progress). 290,1,5: meet. 290,4,6: may not recover (note: cannot stay alive). 290,5,6: only. 290,6,2: nothing else. 290,6,5: made. (O.) 291,3,3: air and sun. (O.) 292,2,1: you have me, God. 292,2,2: in the. (O.) *292,3,1: You would also keep. 292, 3,2: me graciously this day. *292,4,1: My body and my soul too. (O.) *292,4,3: into thy hands I commend. (O.) 292,4,5: ('tis thy gift and bounty). 292, '7,7: modestly (note: has determined). 293,2,2: patron of Israel. 294,3,4: what we (O. that). 296,5,2: able (note: decreed). 296,7,2: nothing I me. 297,7,3: stop. (O.) 298,1,4: by his'n angel in. 300,1,3: in this "night danger. (300, 2, 6: and what thy will... 300, 4, 8: redeems. (300,7,3: I will not turn from thee. 300,8,2: for thy goodness. 300,9,5: to fall asleep. (O.) 301,1,1: beautiful. 301,2,3: from all sin. (O.) 301,3,3: begunt (note: committed). 301,7,4: he is to me. (O.) 302,2,1: senses. *302, 2,2: (lay your sleep [O.]). 302,6,2: to-day (so throughout). 302,16,1: well then. (O.) *303,2,2: no evil. *303,4,4: with worthy gifts. (O.) 304, -3,2: would. (O.) 304, 3, 3: lay I. (O.) 304, 6, 3: incense and my ram. (O.) 304, 7, 4: nothing better. 305,3,2: what peril. 306,2,1: But this. (O.) 306,3,1-4: Therefore give us both, O Lord God, help us at last also out of all trouble! So we praise your goodness here and also there for eternity. 307, 3, 5: and of us. 307,4, 2: now at table. 309,1, 3: for all his. (O.) *309, 2, 4: never anything. *309, 4, 4: has us that. 309, 7, 3: the great with. *311, 3, 6: watchful am. *312, 2, 4: and from Satan. (O.) 313, 3, 1: the heavy sleep, O Lord Christ, 313, 4, 1: fall asleep, 313, 4, 2: yet let our hearts be valiant. 313, 4, 3: shield us, God's right hand, 313, 6,2: lie. 313, 6, 3: of the soul. 313, 7, 2: also to his son likewise. 314,1, 3: to the pious. (O.) 314,2, 3: under thy wings. *315,1,3: turn to thee graciously. 315,4,4: means (note: loves). 315,12,2: over me today. 315,14,1: let me have mine. 316, 5, 8: that. 316, 6, 6: his flock. 316, 7,1: then. *318, 3, 3-6: (the old Adam I often feel, who provokes me to evil and calls. If I had used grace rightly, he would be dead and gone in me. [319,1, 4: senses. 319, 4,1: body now hastens. (O.) 319,5, 6: sins work. (O.) 319,6,2: goes and. (O.) 319,7, 6: Israel's. 319,9,3: an accident. (O.) *319,9,4: sleep blessedly. (O.) *319,9,6: of his angelic host. (320,3,3: mercifully to me. 320,5,3: oh, but. (320,6,2: before the court. *320, 7 and 8: are transposed in the original. 320, 10,2: O Lord God of hosts. 321,1,2: senses. 321,1,8: beschmitzet (note: damaged by fraud), 321, 6,3: verglichen (note: reconciled by offsetting the debt). 321,7,7: dark here. 321,8,4: produce. 321,9,3: let my heart. (O.) 321,9,4: cunningly (note: eagerly considered). 321,9,7: bekleibe (note: cling). 322, 5, 3: sv as. 322, 6, 7: with this. 323, 3, 5: can bring me true peace. (O.) 325,2,3: my heart steady. (O.) *325,4,5: in faith also my heart speaks. (325,5,1: I am already fallen. (O.) 325,5,2: I thereby not. (325,5,3: I find. 325,5,4: with him. (325,5,6: I'll bear it after all. (O.) 325,6,3: to stretch out the shield. 325,8,2: upper hand. (325,8,4: to have. (O.) 325,8,5: that me. 325,9,6: I do not burden my JEsum. (O.) 325,10,4: the great Prince of Victory, the Son of God, (O.). 326,1,3: my work, doings, and being. (O.) 326,2, 6: me today and further. (O.) 326, 3, 4: and me from. (O.) 328, 1, 4: go. 328,5,4: peace be't. 329,2,6: (father-). 329,6,3: where he put me. (O.) 329, 6, 4: me. (O.) 329,7,1: wild (O.) desert. 329,7,2: Christo. 329,7,6: as there, so also here. 329, 8,1: these. (O.) 329, 8, 6: all (other). 329, 9, 6: (after that). 329, 11, 6: will (with God) him. 329, 13, 5: with some. (O.) 329,14,6: ask (to be). *330,1,3: to the people. (O.) 330,4,3: pilgrim. *331,3,2: that he will at. (O.) 331,3,5: by fire. (O.) *331,4,1-6: he leadeth us with his eyes, he chasteneth us with his hand. When lust and weather are no more, his garment covers us. Yes, his love alone can be the best shield in the storm. (O.) 331,5,1: is to us cloud'- and. (O.) 331,5,3: through him the. (O.) *331,5, 4: is made but a step. (O.) *331,6,3: He hath given us the hand out of it. (O.) *331, 7,2: that there around. (O.) *331, 8,3: until the fatherland shall become us. (O.) 331,8,4: to heaven in. (O.) 331,10,1: we travel. (O.) 331,10, 4: to our. (O.) 331,10, 6: that us. (O.)

331,11,3: Be our guiding star here from earth. (O.) *331,11,5: us with the rose train, (O.). *331,11, 6: which may be walked up there. (O.) 331,12,1: with us. (O.) 331,12,4: bestow on ours at home. 332,1,3: anew. *332,2,1-8: Out, give thanks to our God, that peace and rest dwell here! The Lord has spared us war and famine. No fire, no flood, no heavy hailstorm, nor evil pestilence has ravaged us until this day. (O.) *332,3,3: Who, if God were not, 332,3,4: would have spared us the fruit? (O.) 332,4,2: Sowing, plowing. (O.) 332, 4,3: we would without him. (O.) 332,4,4: not a grain. (O.) 332,5,1: guard and watch. (O.) 332,5,3: his father's blessing makes. (O.) 332, 6,1-4: The abundance of blessings is now introduced, that one must confess that God. (O.) 332,7,5: We praise. (O.) 332,8,7.8: Therefore your people and your property praise you day and night. (O.) 332, 9,1: mildly rich God. (O.) 332, 9,4: never ours. (O.) *332,9, 5-8: Preserve from fear and sorrow, from pestilence, floods of water, from war and dear time; keep us in thy guard! (O.) *332:10, 1-8: Bless, faithful God, that which we eat daily; give bread also to the poor, you cannot forget them. O Lord, thy mild hand please every man, that with us city and country may feel the blessing. (O-). 332,11,1: Let our grain go to seed. (O.) *332,11,5-7: let everyone see, you be, O LORD of hosts, who can work wonders, (O.). 332,12,1-4: praise, honor, thanksgiving, praise and glory bring to you at all times your true possession, O God of eternities, (O.). *334,1,3: the everlasting. 335, 3,2: zeal shy' (note: shy of angering parents). 335,4,3: from the beginning. (O.) 337,3, 7: in everlasting salvation. (O.) 338, 8, 2: a great G'winn. 338, 8, 6: gladly suffice. *339, 2, 2: source are. *339, 2, 4: flowing. 339, 8, 4: faithful to. (O.) 339, 10, 4: to thee be honored. *341,1,5: let the song of praise. *341,2,4: to thee always. (O.) 341,3,5: over thee. 342,3,4: thereby we. (342.5.3: give you health. *342, 5, 4: war, dearth, death. (O.) *342, 7,1: Value, O Holy Ghost. 345,1,4 u. 6,4: abundantly thou hast bestowed. *347,6,2: from (O.) his people and land. 347,8,3: when we. *348,1,12: those who suffer in his kingdom. (O.) 348,3,7: of right (note: by right). 348,4,3: love G'meine. (O.) *348,5,4: by grace promised to us. 348,5,6: to leave us entirely in him. 349,5,3: to help us. *349,8,3: your comforting, sweet teaching. 349,9,4: O Lord God of hosts. 349,10,5: shows. 349,15,4: I am with your angels. 350,6,5.6: to those who find nowhere else. 351,8,4: touched. (O.) 351,10,2: are. 351,12,4: as thy child. (O.) 352,4,2: and thy' person. (O.) 352, 5,1: lead us. (O.) 352, 6, 4: thy sweet consolation. (O.) 352, 9, 4: eternal me. (352, 10, 2: my heart's treasure. (O.) 352,10,3: yes, indeed. (352,11,3: I do. (O.) 352,12,1: death I. (O.) *352,16,1: Therefore I will all the days of my life. 352,17,2: the run. (O.) The hymn originally contains 12 six-line stanzas to the tune of "Our Father in the Kingdom of Heaven," very incongruously changed into 18 four-line ones. Return to the original would be very desirable. 353: The heading: "In Sterbensläuften" should be deleted. 353,1,6: that must. 355,6,4: plagues. (O.) 356,2,7: almost (note: very). 356,3,6: with you. (O.) *356,4,5: among yours. (O.) 356, 4, 7: on the plan. (O.) 356, 4, 10: in the wind. (O.) 356, 7,3: steams. (O.) 358, 1, 3: oftentimes. 359, 6, 3: you know. (O.) 359, 7,3: you must. (O.) *359, 7, 9: Therefore, O soul, consider. (O.) 359: Between the 6th and 7th str. the O. has still the following, which should be inserted again: God yet liveth; soul, why dost thou despair? Let heaven and earth fall to ruins, let hell be set on fire, let the enemy be embittered, let death and the devil flash: he who trusts in God, he will protect. Soul, then consider: if our Lord God still lives! 360,3,3: Sweat of blood. (O.) *364,1, 4: his blissful. (O.) 364,3, 3: My own will can only deceive. (O.) 364, 3, 4: who that. 364, 5, 5: Will' be done. 365, 5,3: ropes. 365, 5, 6: false guile. 365, 7, 1: praise, honor, and glory. 365,7,2: Be prepared Father, Son and Spirit, 365,7,3: Praise his holy name! 367,7,1: Now shall'. (O.) 368, 26: by thy holy birth. 368, 43: and comfort them. 368, 48: council, school and community. (O.) 369,1,7: towards heaven. (O.) 369,2,6: speak. (O.) *369, 2, 8: after which so many' are. (O.) 369, 5, 5: ever. (O.) 369, 6, 8: alsdann. 370, 2, 7: raptured. 370, 3, 3: over me. 370, 4, 5: the payment already. 370, 6, 5: God me. (O.) 370, 7, 5: to whom then burneth. *370, 8, 7: and swiftly breaketh his yoke. 370,10,7: only. 371, 4, 3: against me, his child, *371,

5,4: still live. (O.) *371,9,2: which as a Christian I should hate. 373,2,3: nothing of. (O.) *373,2,5: what I find good in me. *373,2,6: that I have from you alone. *373,2,8: thou shalt give as thou pleasest. (O.) *373,4,1: Jesus, fountain of all. 373,4,2: who comforts no one from you. 373,4,4: but your disciples. (O.) 373,5,4: as often as I have to go into the. (O.) 373,6,7: about me. 373,7,6.7.8: Louse, equal to all the elect, I of faith. (O.) 373,8,4: stand by myself. (O.) 373,9,6: may'. *373,9,8: help me mine. (O.) 374,1,5: evening and. *374,2,5: help in. (O.) 374,5,2: which he us both. 374,6,1: when once the world. 374,6,4: that before was great, 374, 6, 5: yea, then also after death. 374, 7, 7: does not have to. (O.) 374,8,5: that of all. 374,8,6: without all end. *374,9,4: acquired us and grace. 376,5,4: nothing. (377,3,4: when. (O.) 377,4,5: help, help, help. (O.) 378, 5,6: forttreiben (note: to drive on, to promote). 379,1,1: dem. (O.) 379,1,6: pious, just. 379,5,5: craves and. 379,12,2: such grace and goodness. (O.) *380, 5, 2-4: mark what the truth teaches: Satan will not deceive you, who perverts the whole world. (O.) *382, 1, 4: in all distress. (O.) *382,3, 2: be yet. (O.) *382, 3, 6: very well. (O.) 382, 6, 1: light things. 382,6,3: small and poor. (O.) 383,6,3: from the front. 383,6,4: yet once. *384,1,3.4: How long have I cried to thee with high sorrowful courage and mind! (O.) 384,7,4: melancholy. 384,10,3: so outrageous. *384,10,4: command, must. 384,12,2: pain. 384,14,1: then. *384,14,2: overbearer. 385,2, 5: for steadily. 385,2, 6: over me. 385,4, 5: faithfulness remains with thee. 386,1,2: bloody rod. (O.) 387,3,1: our eye. 388,1,9: Saviour fron (note: the glorious, divine Saviour). 388,2,4: den. (O.) Since this song applies only to the defensive war against Turks) pagans and papists, it should be replaced by another. 389,2,5: peace. 389,5,1-8: should be deleted because inappropriate. 389,5,8: whose. 390,4,3: we will. (O.) 391,4, 2: and by his' righteousness. *391,4,3: money and good. (O.) 392,3,4: whereas thine. 394,2,6: far more than self. 394,3,2: face hath hid. 394,4,3: yes still have. 394,5,5: was only yours. *394,9,2-6: now we stand aligned, but we are weak children of men, who are often very close to their fall; for even those who seem to stand firm, often fall before they think they will. *394,10, 5: act. 394,11, 6: inherit that which is yours. 395,1, 7: they must. (O.) 395,2,5: give rain to us. 395,3,1-3: Remember, O Lord, thy covenant for thy name's sake, (we beseech thee from the bottom of our hearts), (O.). *395, 4,1: other God. 395,4,2: should'. (O.) 395,5,1-7: This stanza should be deleted, because it does not belong to the song. 396: Heading to be deleted. 397,1,5.6: genesen to the great. (O.) 397,3,5: out of. (O.) 397,4,4: serve God before his. (O.) 397,5,3: there on. 397, 5,4: the apostle's number. 397, 5, 5: there in. 397, 7, 5: and of the golden crown of honor, (O-). 397, 7, 6: stand there. (O.) 398, 3, 7: cries of pain. 399, 4: though here also. (400,1, 4: with peace. (O.) 401,2,3: willingly. (401,10,2: and only. (401,12,8: soon to follow thee also. 402,1,3: in bone and marrow. (402,2,4: if my soul... (402, 2, 5: when now my life's term shall pass. (O.) 402, 2, 6: is no more. (O.) *402,4,3: thou art from everlasting. (O.) 402,4,7: will. (O.) *402,6,6: the last sigh. (O.) *403,1,3: that now gradually. 403,2,3: has suffocated me so completely. *403,3,6: how long must I long? 403,4,6: to rest and. 403, 5, 6: my great. (O.) *404,7, 5. 6: Paradise, drein dein' Huld den Schächer wiesen. 404,8,2: hearing also. *404,8,7: thou wilt make me blessed. (O.) 404, 8, 8: lead the right way to heaven. (O.) 405, 6,1: How often will. 405, 8, 6: soon alleviate. (O.) 406: "Herzlich tut mich Verlangen," etc. 407: originally has 8 six-line stanzas: Wackernagel rightly calls the four-line stanza section "a bad habit"; it should be eliminated. *407, 7, 1: Aufstehn mir verleih. 407, 10, 3: und zu mir. 408) 2:3, 4: he is not dead, he sleeps and rests. (O.) *408, 3, 3: return to him soon. 408 (8) 4: was. (O.) 409, 1, 5: me away. 409, 4, 2: whose. 409, 9, 1: up there. (O.) 409, 13, 8: along with. (O.) 410,2,7: of all the senses power. 410,5,2: captured. (O.) *410,6,6: and hateth that which thou lovest? *410,7,4: spares then. 411,1,3: soon put. (O.) 411,1, 5: not. (O.) *411,2, 2: begat. (O.) *411,2,4: has given birth. (O.) 412,2,3: thou fosterest me. (O.) *413,2,7: with loud. (O.) 413,10,8: an angelic life. 414,1, 6: would be. (O.) 414,3, 6: poor. (O.) 414, 4, 7: angels. (O.) 416,1,3: seek'n. 416,2, 5: That do. (O.) 416,2,12:

Hell Embers. 416,3,1: hell fear. 416,3,2: our sins. 416,1.2.3: Kyrieleison! 417,6,4: shine like. (O.) 417 2,1.2: where I. 417,2,3: the weak. (O.) 417,4,2: displaced (note: transformed). 418,6,3: nothing sweeter. (O.) 418,9,2: of sins. (O.) 418,9,4: bang and woe. 418,13,3: to heal. (O.) 418,14,2: where before (brackets to be deleted). 419,2,1: do not be alarmed. *419, 5, 3: henceforth is now. *419, 5, 5: for the wages of any sin. 419, 8, 2: Tired. 420: Heading to be deleted. 420,2,2: thou art dead. (O.) *420,3, 9.10: according to thy word, O faithful refuge. (O.) 421, 2, 3: a little while ago. 421, 4, 1: her body. (O.) 421, 7, 6: mott (note: mud, mustiness). 421, 8, 2: the day of thy death. (O.) 421, 10, 3: will. (O.) 421,11, 6: and will equal punishment' to him. 421,12,6: all by wickedness is disfigured. 422,1,2: cover. (O.) 422,7,1: then. (O.) 422,9,3: his victory ensign. (O.) 422,10,4: after some' few. 422,11,1: sepulchral songs. *422,11,2.3: they have already put my limbs to sleep. (O.) 422,11, 6: Farewell! 423, 3, 2: drawn. 423, 5,5. 6: so will I come to him by true faith alone good. *423, 7, 6: my' soul from the body. 423, 9,3: the course. (O.) 423, 9, 5: all earthly. 423,10,2: turn me. 423,10, 6: is now no longer here. 424,4,4: what in. 425: heading to be deleted. 425,2,2: waking night. (O.) 425,2,8: therefore be not so. (O.) *425,3,3: of the most high Lord. 425,3,5.6: now so weep and even so. 425, 5,1. 2: drive - drive. 425, 5, 8: this one. 425, 7, 2: winner. 425,10, 4: and every moment. (O.) 425,10,7: contentious (note: opinionated, recalcitrant). 425, 13: is to be separated from st. 12 by daredevil stroke. 426,1,1: valet (note: parting). 427, 5,1. 2: HErr, if only I have thee, thou best gift. 428,1, 2: and I shall drive. (O.) 429,8,1: nothing is what. (Cf. 7:4.) 430:1, 2: as in haste. (O.) 430,1,4: dried up. 430, 8,5: me as one. 431, 5: help us. (O.) 431, 7.8: with all the little angels to thy'm. (O.) 432, 17,3: and done. (O.) 433, 1,4: pious. 433,2,2: end of the world. 433,2,6: from hour. 433,4,5: bald bestehn (note: unable to answer in court). 433,5,4: drawn in. *433, 7, 6: make us in grace. 434, 6, 4: such term (note: in such time). 434,7,4: such splendor. 434,8,6: wind. 484,10,6: to put in great tribulation. 434,11,2: of all clouds. 434,12,2: as they were at first. 434,12, 5: groaning. (O.) 434,15,1: thou wretched one. 434,17: This stanza should be deleted, because idle addition. 436,3,2: and with angelic tongues. *436,3,4.5: the gates of thy city; we stand in chorus. *436, 3,10-12: Therefore we rejoice, and caught thee hallelujah for and for. 437, 7,3: meien (note: to reap, to harvest). 438, 2,1: man's strength and wit. 438, 3, 1: rage very. 438, 3, 5: einhergehn. 438, 3, 6: stand. 438, 5, 5: her' rope'. (O.) 438, 5, 6: teach'. 438,6,7: wait for your help. 438,8,6: help until. 439,2,8: not. 439,13,1: make fruitful. 440,6,1. 2: so noble a nature, O thou reasonable. 440,10, 2: of thy substance. (440,11,1: when. *440,12,3: for his good deed. *440,13,2: for all your goodness. 441,2, 5: for. *441, 5, 6: for his graciousness. 442, 2, 1: nothing. (O.) 442, 2, 2: now rather. (O.) 442, 3, 4: tear g'waltiglich. (O.) 442, 5, 4: poverty must now suffer. 442, 6, 2: bring us no'n. 412, 7,1: are their poison (note: fall prey to them). 442, 8, 3: even overhand. (O.) 442,10,1: themselves not. *442,10, 4: for always eat, drink very. (O.) 442,14, 2: the earth. 443: Original superscription: "A song of the heavenly Jerusalem." 443,1,6: flat field. 443,1,7: all over. (Cf. 171, 2, 2.) 443, 2, 3: desire, with joy and free courage. (O.) 443,7,1: I am gone. (O.) 443,7,6: one plays. (O.) 443,8,2: in choirs.

## Addendum

to the article published in November 1909 in "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) about the increase of the song inventory of our hymnal.

Although the Commission for the Improvement of our Church Hymnal, appointed by the Synod, has completed its work with the completion of the above article, it believes that it still owes the Synod an explanation regarding the songs it proposed a year ago that might be included in the Hymnal. - That the Commission at that time submitted to the Synod a number of hymns

As can be seen from the introductory words, this was only because she wanted to do justice to the requests that had come to her from all parts of the Synod. Not only individual pastors, but also whole conferences had turned to her with the request to procure all kinds of songs, especially for special occasions, for which our hymnal offers nothing or only little; and so she saw herself induced to go in search of such. What she now wishes to emphasize most emphatically is this, that by a mere oversight the songs she had collected were published before it was possible for her to revise them, as she had reserved the right to do; for that some of these songs were not entirely faultless she was well aware from the beginning. After completing the difficult work of revising the text of the entire hymnal, the commission therefore also subjected the selected hymns to a thorough examination and now has the honor of presenting the result to the Synod. - As before, we maintain that it is our duty to take into account, as far as possible, the requests we have received, and we therefore retain the types of hymns proposed; for good reasons, however, we take the liberty of making various deletions and of making such changes to the remaining hymns as we deem necessary and advisable. In order to save lengthy comments, dear readers are asked to take the relevant issue of "Lehre und Wehre" (November 1909) at hand in order to better understand the following remarks.

Of the Sunday hymns, we delete all but the first. We leave this in place because we consider the wish justified that, since our hymnal contains only one actual Sunday hymn, namely No. 6, which cannot be used well because of its length, a second, shorter one should find a place in the hymnal. Likewise, in accordance with a frequently expressed wish, we retain the three hymns. Corrections: In the first: O Holy Spirit; in the second: for us you were born man, - to strive for your will; in the third: true. Of the Advent hymns we retain only the first. Corrections: St. 2, 6: Christianity in all places, - St. 3, 6: for he proved. Of the Christmas hymns we delete the first. The 5th stanza of the second we omit, and to the last we give the version: "Sweet Immanuel, be born also in me! Come, my Savior, for without you I am lost. Dwell in me, make me all one with thee, Who for love hast chosen me." In the third, "Simeon" is to be placed in the 2nd line of the 1st stanza. The Epiphany hymn we leave; but the last line of the 4th stanza should read, "JEsus accepts my sacrifice." The baptismal and confirmation hymns, encouraged by many, we retain all of them, especially since they are all suitable for singing by the confirmands at the confirmation ceremony. Corrections: In the third: Str. 3, 3: I have of thy spirit's shoots; in the fourth: Str. 5, 5: sweet mouth, Str. 7,3: without reward; in the seventh: Str. 2, 9: an abomination without thee. Of the ordination and introduction hymns we retain the first and second. Corrections: in the first: str. 1:6: the jetzund; in the second: Str. 3,2: through which you yourself are heard, Str. 4, 6: and make them wise, Str. 7, 6: division that divides us, Str. 8, 5: urge through, Str. 8, 6: until once hearth' and shepherd. Of the Kirch Weihlieder we retain the second. Correction: St. 2,1: itself, St. 2,2 is to be deleted after hearth the apostrophe, St. 4,1: blessed. Of the school carols, the Commission deletes the first. The bell-

we will leave the "weihlied". Corrections: St. 1,5: you have graciously given her to us, St. 4,1: the child covered with the filth of sin, St. 4,3: the sinner whom your wrath terrifies, St. 5,1: to the marriage altar. We delete the organ dedication hymn. Of the missionary hymns we retain the first, third and fifth. Corrections: In the first: St. 1, 8: there is still room; in the third: St. 1, 6: but the whole world into it, St. 2, 2: a right blessing louse, St. 4, 6: JEsu, go out everywhere; St. 6, 3: that the good part we choose; in the fifth: St. 2, 1: O that soon JEsu, go out everywhere; St. 6, 3: that the good part we choose. 2,1: O that thy fire would soon be kindled; St. 3,2: this petition is put into our mouths; St. 4,6: thy kingdom would be ours; St. 5,4: O would it be; St. 6,3: that we would soon remove it out of the way; St. 7,5: let faithful teachers. The eighth strophe is to be deleted. We leave all the songs mentioned under XII to XV. In the song "Fahre fort" ("Continue"), the following footnote is to be added to "Stuhl" ("Chair"), verse 3:5: "die Herrschaft des Teufels" ("the rule of the devil"), Revelation 13:2; in the song "Verzage nicht" ("Do not despair"), verse 1:3: "zu verstören" ("to disturb"), verse 1:4: "davon dir wird sehr angst und bang" ("of which you will be very afraid and anxious"); in the song "Wie schön ist's doch" ("How beautiful it is"), verse 1,10: young and old, St. 5, 7.8: suffer, avoid; in the song "Herzlich tut mich verlangen", St. 4,3: yet be raised, St. 4,6: and live without all distress, St. 4,8: What harm is death to me?

These are the corrections. Right here the committee would like to make a heartfelt request to all readers that if anyone knows of a good song for special occasions, they would like to send it in to them. For example, does anyone have a good song for the New Year's Eve celebration? As the desire for a larger number of missionary songs seems to be general, the Commission takes the liberty of submitting the following for consideration. The first has already been approved, as it were, by the Synod. It comes from the pen of the blessed Pastor H. Fick, who has given us many a beautiful poetic gift, and is printed in the "Lutheraner" of September 15, 1884. The second has Gustav von Mengden, 1625-1688, as its author.

## I.

Mel.: O breaker of all bonds.

Arise, thou comfort of the Gentiles, JEsu, bright and morning star!
Let thy word, the word of gladness, resound near and far, That it may bring peace to all whom the enemy holds captive, And praise and honour to thee be heard throughout all the heathen world.

Behold the affliction of the spiritually blind, Who see not thy splendour, And, until they find thee, Go desolately astray!
Behold the woe of all the heathen: Darkness covereth them, And in the darkness of their affliction Hope never refresheth them.

Alas, in these darknesses would we also lie altogether, If we were not torn out of it The heir poor wonderful. Kindly has he appeared to us In grace's lofty splendour, That we now with joy serve Him Who makes us so blessed.

Now that we have experienced your salvation, love must never cease to reveal it to the world, as you have commanded us to do: To proclaim to all creatures God's word of eternal salvation, That the forgiveness of sins may be granted to all men.

More' in us your fire of love, O Lord, to stand by the Gentiles, That we pray ever more faithfully For mercy on them, That we gladly give gifts For your gospel And send many pious messengers To proclaim your fame.

Now, let thy light, O God, appear unto the heathen far and near! From the streets, from the fences Call them by thy star! Lead them whom thou hast chosen, Out of the devil's kingdom; For for all that are lost, There is yet room in the Father's house.

II.

Mel.: O that I had a thousand tongues.

The city of God is established, The walls of her splendor stand firm. It is the LORD that bindeth the bars , And maketh the gates of Zion glorious. Blessed art thou, O great city of the LORD. The counsel of God is preached in thee.

I will, saith he, from Freudendingen crying out in the world; I will yet bring to the truth, That which abhorreth the heathen. It is I who do great wonders Through my Son's redeeming blood.

They shall say joyfully in Zion, That God will keep the city in building, And that there strange nations from the world will get along. In all tongues the sound, the song, and the word of the Lord are heard. (Ps. 87.)

Finally, the Commission should be allowed to answer a question that has often been put to it, namely, how it thinks the proposed hymns should be classified in our hymnal. Their intemperate opinion is this: Since the numbering of the hymns in our hymnal should in any case remain the same, the hymns for which a rubric already exists could be inserted in the appropriate place according to the procedure of older and newer hymnals under the designation a, b, so that hymn no. 6, which is already in the hymnal, would be designated 6 a, and the new Sunday hymn to be added would be designated 6 b. The hymns for which no rubric already exists could be inserted under the designation a, b, in the appropriate place. Those songs, on the other hand, for which there is no rubric, would have to be added as a special appendix at the end.

Hymnal Committee: A. Crull.

O. Hattstädt.

## An addendum to the explanation of Rom. 5, 19.

In the February and March 1909 issues of the Jowaschen "Kirchliche Zeitschrift", Prof. G. Fritschel had challenged the undersigned's interpretation of Rom. 5, 18. 19 in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. I had replied to this in the April 1909 number of this journal. Fritschel's reply was published in the August and December 1909 issues of the "Kirchliche Zeitschrift". Due to other work for "Lehre und Wehre" (Doctrine and Wehre) I have so far been prevented from replying. It seemed to me that there was no **periculum in mora** here. The omission shall be made up for herewith. After all that has been discussed so far **pro and contra in** this matter, there is no need for a new detailed article.

The replica of Fritschel just mentioned deals mainly with the understanding of Rom. 5, 19: ***"Ωσπερ γάρ διά τής παρακοής τον ενός άν& ρώπον αμαρτωλοί κατεστά& ησαν οί πολλοί, όντως και διά τής νπα- κοής τον ενός δίκαιοι καταστα& ήσονται οί*** πολλοί. "For as by the one man's disobedience the many have been set forth as sinners, so also by the obedience of the one

put down as just to many." The status controversy is whether δίκαιοι ***κατασταθήσονται*** is a voluntative future tense, as Fritschel thinks, or a logical one, as I think. For Fritschel also on his part refers the οί ***πολλοί*** like the πάντες ***άνθρωποι*** v. 18 quite correctly to all men, not to believers. First, then, something more about the voluntative future tense! The existence of such a future tense I have never denied. I have, after all, myself quoted the remark from Blaß's Grammar p. 212: "The future tense not only states temporally what will be, but in many cases also what will be according to the intention of the speaker." "Lehre und Wehre" 1909, p. 154. Nor have I denied that this so-called voluntative future tense is often found in main clauses. I have, after all, cited from Blaß the example **λέξω = *βούλομαι λέγειν.*** What I have maintained is that, apart from such figures of speech, since the speaker expresses futurally what he intends to do, what he intends to do, the future tense of intention is used only in dependent clauses, and refer myself to the rule established by Curtius. This is not in conflict with the quotations from the grammars of Delbrück, Moulton, Vogrinz, Aken, Stahl, given by Fritschel, "Kirchliche Zeitschrift," 1909, pp. 380-382. For in these quotations the voluntative future tense is only generally stated, and no distinction is made between the use of it in main clauses and subordinate clauses. With the voluntative future is not to be confounded the future tense, which is used in clauses of command, and the other, which is used in doubtful questions. These latter futures are specially treated by Curtius § 499, and by Blaß § 64, 3 and 6. Thus the passages quoted by Fritschel p. 382 include: Luk. 22, 49; Rom. 6, 2; Matth. 12, 26; 1 Cor. 14, 16, also the epithets cited from my commentary, as **τί *ερούμεν;*** gar.
is not within the scope of our discussion. In any case, Rom. 5, 19 is neither a command nor a question. If we summarize the grammatical material drawn up by Fritschel and myself, we can distinguish a double use of the real voluntative future tense, to which Moulton also points with the words: "**The volitive future involves action depending on the will of the speaker or of the subject of the verb**" and Fritschel himself with the words: "what is to occur according to the intention of the speaker or agent. The voluntative future tense is found first of all in such passages in which a person, e. g. an Attic orator, speaks, or a person is introduced as speaking, and what this speaking person intends to say or do, or what is to happen according to his will, is expressed precisely in the futural tense. It is in the nature of things that in these cases the first person predominates, and the future tense is usually the predicate of a main clause. The use of the future tense in promises, mentioned by Fritschel p. 383, belongs here, where the one promising testifies what he will do. Rom. 9, 25 is used quite correctly

is rendered as "I will name". On the other hand, the voluntative future tense is also used in the middle of the flow of a discussion or narrative, where it then indicates what the acting subject intends to happen or should happen. And here what Curtius remarks applies: "In dependent clauses the indicative futuri denotes an action which is future only in comparison with the main action, that is, which follows the latter in time, whether the latter is in the present or in the past. Hence, in sentences introduced by the relative pronoun or by ***ὅπως,*** the indicative futuri serves to express the intended or aspired consequence." The first of the examples adduced by Curtius for this purpose, and quoted by me l. c., p. 154, contains a future tense referring to a fact of the past. This is also a proof that the future tense has sometimes become quite timeless, and expresses only dependence on another action. And now, when I asked Prof. Fritschel l. c., p. 155, for evidence in which a final future tense is to be read in independent, self-contained sentences, I had in mind, as p. 154 expressly remarks, such idioms as **λέξω**
= ***βούλομαι λέγειν,*** i.e. the first use of the future tense, apart from and.
only the second use of the same in mind, that is, such passages where the futuric statement depends on the will and intention of an agent, not a speaker. Fritschel quotes l. c., p. 382 14 passages from Homer, without expressing or discussing them. I have compared all these proofs, and everywhere found only the first use of the voluntative future, which I had conceded. There a person is introduced speaking throughout, who states in a futuric statement what he wishes to say or ask or do, resp. what is to happen according to his will, e. g. E. g. ***ειρήσομαι, έρέω, έξερέω, ξεῖνον έγώ νποδέξομαι οϊκφ***, "I will receive the stranger into my house," etc. Only in the last place, Od. II, 184, could I discover no future tense at all. Of the five last-mentioned instances from Greek prose writers, only Plato, Apol., 291, is at hand, where likewise the speaker makes known what he intends to do: ***έρήσομαι αυτόν και εξετάσω καί ελέγξω.*** I doubt whether by any of the other four.
The second use of the voluntative future in a main clause or independent clause can be corroborated. Yes, I ask again, to stay with the example already mentioned: Would the Greek really clothe the thought that God wants to save all men so directly and briefly in the future tense: ***Θεός σώσει πάντας άν'& ρώπους'ί.***
And now, returning to Rom. 5:19, it is difficult here to justify grammatically the supposition of a voluntative future tense. For there is not a person here spoken of, and it is not a dependent clause in which δίκαιοι ***καταστaθήσονται is*** to be read. Any dependence of this statement on the will of an acting subject, which alone would account for a final future tense,

is not evident here at all. Fritschel urges the context of the whole passage. Who just in the context a voluntative future tense, a justification of all men only intended by God, which has not been realized at all, has not the slightest support. Rather, as I have already pointed out in my former reply, 5, 12-19, the apostle asserts as fixed facts what became of mankind through Adam and what became of them through Christ, there sin and death, here justification of life. Fritschel refers l. c., p. 539, to the clause of intention v. 21: ***ἵνα ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ*** Annex to the uniform period v. 12-19, which deals with the purpose of the law, the two facts are emphasized: "but where sin has become mighty, grace has become much mightier," v. 20, and then v. 21 is set down as the realization of a divine intention, a divine plan.

And as for the logical future tense, I emphasize once again what I emphasized in my earlier reply, p. 151 ff, that it merely expresses the logical consequence or requirement of a previously mentioned fact, and is in itself purely timeless, and therefore in itself denotes neither past nor present nor future. But for this very reason, just as according to what has been remarked above, the voluntative future tense, when the context entails it, can also refer to a fact of the past. As an example of this I have given l. c., p. 152 Rom. 6, 5: **εἰ *γάρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῳ δμοιώματι του 'δανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλα καί τής ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα.*** The becoming conformed to the likeness of Christ's resurrection, like the becoming conformed to Christ's death, occurred in our baptism. To the I. c., pp. 152. 153, mentioned recent exegetes, who acknowledge the logical future tense, has in the meantime been added Zahn, who in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans has taken both δίκαιοι ***κατασταύλήσονται*** 5, 19 as **σύμφυτοι *ἐσόμεθα*** 6, 5 as a logical

Future tense explained. He remarks on Rom. 5, 19: "The future tense can also here, as sometimes, only be the expression of a logical postulate. As well as the children of Adam came to stand as sinners by virtue of the imputation of Adam's disobedience, which no one can deny, so little is it to be objected that the many who are united to Christ by faith into a new humanity attain the position of the righteous before God, or in the eyes of God, by virtue of the imputation of his perfect obedience, proved in action as well as in suffering." Zahn, though understanding out of context οί ***πολλοί*** v. 19b of believers and **καταστα*& ήσονται of the*** present, has not taken into account the fact that through

correctly rendered the logical future tense indexical relation of the two clauses to each other. Thus we paraphrase, referring οί ***πολλοί*** v. 19b as v. 19a to all men: As well as the many ge- to stand as sinners by virtue of Jmputation of Adam's disobedience.

have come, which no one can deny, so little is it to be objected that the many, by virtue of imputation of Christ's obedience, attain the position of righteous before God, and that is factually as much as have attained. The future tense **σύμφυτοι *εσόμεδα*** explains Zahn as follows.

It expresses the logical demand of an event that does not belong to the past. . . If the baptized, through baptism, have entered into an intimate union with the death of Christ as the type of an event taking place in them, they will, that is, they must, just with it, have entered into an intimate union with the resurrection of Christ as the type of an analogous event in their own lives." He thus also transfers the being grown together with the likeness of Christ's resurrection, that is, the **σύμφυτοι *έσόμε& α,*** to the past. Fritschel remarks in his Replica, p. 538: "But whether this justification of all belongs to the past or present, or still to the future, that can neither be denied nor affirmed from this future tense 'they will be put down.'" "According to St.'s execution, the logical future tense, after all, does not at once mean also the past, but only expresses the (necessary) consequence. Accordingly, he can prove no more from the apostle's words than that the (necessary) consequence of the reconciliation is justification; he can neither prove that this has already occurred, nor that it is yet future." Certainly, by the "logical future tense" in itself I only meant to prove that καταστα***& ήσονται*** could possibly mean the past; whether this was really the case must be evident from the context. Thus I already explained l. c., p. 153: "The context in v. 19, like the context of the whole section from v. 15 on, demands the interpretation we have given of **δίκαιοι *καταστα-& ήσονται οί πολλοί,*** which,
as we have seen, is just linguistically permissible." I repeat: the relation of v. 19 b to v. 19 a demands this interpretation. Since the second fact v. 19 b is inferred from the first fact v. 19 a, it must also be like it. With the disobedience, the fall of Adam, the many were made sinners by the imputation of Adam's disobedience to them; and to this corresponds that in and with the obedience of Christ the many were made righteous by the imputation of Christ's obedience to them. The disobedience of Adam and the obedience of Christ belong to the past, and so also the consequence immediately set with the one and the other. But the connection of the whole passage also proves the correctness of my interpretation. In v. 15 it is said of the gift, which consists in the grace of the one man JEsu Christ, that it poured itself abundantly upon the many, **εις *τούς πολλούς έπερίσσευσεν.*** This is a historical fact. But this gift and grace of JEsu Christ is nothing else than the grace and gift of righteousness v. 17, the justification of life v. 18, the standing of the many as righteous v. 19.

Finally, let it be observed, that "general justification" is not only taught Rom. 5:18, 19, and 2 Cor. 5:19, but also underlies all those remarks of the apostle which deal with the fact that the **δικαιοσύνη -*& εον*** produced by Christ, this judgment of God, is revealed, made known, and presented in the gospel, and received by faith. For there this judgment of God is regarded as a ready gift and good available to all men. G. St.

## Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. A picture of D. Walther for his hundredth birthday. The picture, made from one of the best photographs, is to be had in three editions: Size 4X5-3/4 inches in polished brass frame at 25 cents each; per dozen $2.40 and postage. Size 4-3/4X6½ inches in polished brass frame at 45 cems the piece; per dozen $4.32 and postage. Size 7½X9½ inches in black ebony like frame at 80 cents each; per dozen $7.68 and postage.

2. "American Calendar for German Lutherans for the Year 1911 after the Birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ." In addition to the calendar, the pastors' and teachers' lists and all kinds of other material and reading material, this calendar contains an excellent biography of D. Walther on the occasion of his hundredth birthday on October 25, 1911.

3. ***Lutheran Annual*** 1911, which pp. 14-20 give an excellent characterization of D. Walthers and pp. 20-25 offering all main data from his life. (10 Cts.)

4. Southern District Synodal Report with doctrinal negotiations on "creation". (11 Cts.)

5. Synodical Report of the Atlantic District, with a paper on "the Wonders of the Christian Religion." F. B.

**Brosamlein**. Short devotions for all days of the year. Presented to the Christian People of the German Tongue by Carl MantheyZorn. **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo. Price: $2.00.

This book offers a devotional for each day of the year, short enough to be read in the morning or evening, even in the busiest family. "The devotions are arranged according to the church year and are divided into three groups. The first group, extending from the 1st Sunday of Advent to the close of Trinity week, contains all that belongs to this festal half of the Church year (Feast and Passion devotions). The second group, covering the period from the 1st to the 16th Sunday after Trinity (inclusive), brings devotions interpreting our dear Catechism. The last 57 devotions, covering the weeks from the 17th to the 24th Sunday after Trinity, deal with the Christian life and finally with the Christian's death. Each group is also introduced, at the author's express wish, by a puffing full picture, which gives some expression to the character for the devotional course of the week." The book is XVI and 452 pages thick, tastefully bound in cloth and adorned with 52 full-page illustrations. It is excellently suited for colportage and gifts at weddings, birthdays, etc. It is a book of edification. It is a book of edification in the best sense of the word: rich in teaching, punishment, admonition, warning and consolation, just as the children of God of our time need them. May our Christians therefore reach for this book and then use it diligently and devoutly! The book is preceded by a picture of D. Walther and the following beautiful dedication: "In memory of the blessed doctor

C. F. W. Walther, the faithful witness of truth, the founder of the Church of the Pure Word and Sacrament in America, best loved by the friends of truth, best hated by the enemies of truth, whose heart burned for the true good of the Christian people, this book is dedicated in unforgotten gratitude by the author. " F. B.

**Grandfather's Memories of Youth**. By Carl Manthey-Zorn. Part One: Downward. Part two: upward. **Northwestern Publishing House**, Milwaukee, Wis. Price: @ vol. 80 cts.

In the preface it says: "The first part shall bear the title: Downwards, and the second part shall be called: Upwards. For first it went downward with me, but then outward. Both I mean in spiritual relation. In the first part, therefore, there will be mainly such things as will be interesting to Christian readers, but will not please them; this I will say at once. Well, I don't like it either. But when it goes up, it will be both interesting and good." We believe that some of the pieces in these "Memoirs of Youth" do not deserve to be printed. But there is no lack of parts which would interest even a theologian. For example, p. 143 s.: "We made individual items the object of special study. For instance, the doctrine of the Church and the ministry. On this we were utterly uncertain. We read quite a number of monographs on it. I remember those of Löhe, Delitzsch, Trebitz, Haupt. After reading them, we were probably even more unclear than before. We decided to consult the director, who had always helped us to clarity. We were just gathered in my living room. I went down to the director (Hardeland of the Leipzig Mission) and asked him to come to us. He went right along. In my parlor he sat down from my lectern and asked what we wanted. We told him that it was desolate and empty in our heads, and that it was dark in the depths of our hearts about the doctrine of church and ministry. "Can you not," we asked, "name us a book that will give us right exclusion about it, and offer not uncertain private opinions, but the teaching of Scripture and the Confession?" Immediately he replied: 'I can do that. Get hold of Walther's book." "Walther? Who is Walther?" we asked. He explained to us that Walther was a theologian emigrated from Saxony to America of the clearest cops, of unbreakable confessional loyalty, and of "lion character." We first said, "But what good can come from America?" He replied, "Get the book and read it!" So we did. And bright and clear became to us the teaching of Scripture and the confession of the church and ministry." About his visit to a meeting in Erlangen Fr. Zorn writes: "At the appointed time I went and found a small number of all sorts of people gathered. The parochial vicar greeted me and introduced me to the others. I do not remember the people. I only know that there was a student there who was connected with Pastor Löhe in Neuendettelsau and later became a pastor in the Iowa Synod. Then there were quite a few citizens. First, a scripture was read that was written against chiliasm (the doctrine of the millennial kingdom). This was "refuted" sentence by sentence, that is, ridiculed and pulled down. Then the parochial vicar recited his doctrine. At a time not far off all Israel should be converted, many believers who had fallen asleep should be resurrected, Christ should walk visibly on earth, a kingdom of the glory of the Church should be on earth, all those who are still unbelievers must then cower, the sun and moon will shine brighter, the Jerusalem temple will stand on a high mountain, Israel will be the centre of the church, but all others will often come to Jerusalem with joy and worship, the land will give its growth in an unexpected way, everything will laugh in peace. And this will last for a thousand years. Then three and a half years the Antichrist will come with great multitudes and storm Jerusalem; there will be great distress. But then Christ will come with all the holy angels to help and to judge and to deliver forever. At the end, the song was sung: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you heaven under the moon .

LUTHER ON SIN AND THE FLOOD. Commentary on Genesis. By *John Nicholas Lenker,* D. D. Vol. II. The Luther Press, Minneapolis, Minn. Price: $1.65.

The year 1910 will remain memorable for the Lutheran Church in America also because the great St. Louis edition of Luther's works was completed in that year. And the fact that the English translation of Luther's works, organized by D. Lenker, is also making good progress, must fill every Lutheran with joy and good hope for the future. It is, after all, already the 14th octavo volume that is now available in print in English. Every Lutheran pastor who is not proficient in German and Latin to the extent of enjoying Luther in the original language should not fail to reach for this English Luther. In his preface Lenker says: "**The passive interest, therefore, on the part of German and Scandinavian pastors and congregations in circulating the English Luther, as far as their young people are concerned, should give way to active interest for the sake of their own work in the future.**" This, of course, is doubly and trebly true of the English pastors and congregations of the Council,' General Synod, etc., many of whom it is evident at every turn that the literary atmosphere in which they live, weave, and feel at ease and in their element, is not the Lutheran one. What a blessing it would be to the American Lutheran Church if all the Lutheran pastors of our country would undertake a serious study of Luther's writings! As by no other means would all false union be prevented and the true unity of the church be initiated. The present volume of 329 pages begins with the 4th and concludes with the 9th chapter of Genesis. The translation is by Father Gohdes and Prof. Schaller.

F. B.

**Luther's words and confessional passages as echoes of the Calvin celebration**. With a preface by M. Willkomm. Zwickau i. S. Publisher and printer Joh. Herrmann. 1910. Price: 10 Cts.

"The Calvin celebration was, as the editor, Father M. Willkomm, aptly remarks in the preface to this booklet, 'a triumph of unionism'. But where this 'comes to dominate, the Church is ruined, she loses her precious goods, the certainty and joyfulness of her testimony is gone, she ceases to be what she is supposed to be according to God's will, a pillar and foundation of truth, etc., and truthfulness is also gone'. With aptly selected pithy words from the writings of our Reformer and with the most important words of our Confessional Writings in this regard, the editor has now given a warning and admonishing testimony against the Union spirit that is spreading like a plague in ever more places, confusing and devastating everything. May this very timely little book serve as a serious warning to many, as well as a strengthening and preservation against all unionism and fanaticism."

**Negotiations of the Synod of the Ev.-Luth. Free Church in Saxony a. St.** at their 34th annual meeting in ülzen. 1910. published by the Luth. Schriftenverein, Zwickau i. S. Price: N. 1.

This report of 113 pages offers 1. a synodal address on Matt. 5:13-16; 2. the annual report of the synod; 3. two theses on the doctrine of the spiritual priesthood; 4. a paper on the nature, purpose, form, and application of public absolution. F. B.

**The Gospel of Mark,** interpreted by D. Gustav Wählender g. Verlag von A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 8; hardback: N. 9.60.

This is the second volume of the commentary on the New Testament edited by D. Zahn with the assistance of Bachmann, Ewald, Riggenbach, and Wohlenberg, which offers the usual introductory remarks on Mark and his Gospel in the first 35 pages, and consists of the following (36-402) pages

the interpretation of the Gospel of Mark, which Wohlenberg thus divides: Heading and Introduction, ch. 1, 1-14; Section I: Preliminary Survey of JEsu's Activity in Galilee, ch. 1, 14-3, 6; Section II: From the Election of JEsu to the Rejection in Nazareth, ch. 3, 7-6, 6; Section III: From the Sending of the Disciples to the Healing of the Blind in Bethsaida, ch. 6, 6-8, 26; Section IV: From the Confession of Messiah by the Disciples at Caesarea Philippi to Shortly before the Arrival in Jericho, ch. 8, 27-10, 45; Section V: JEsus, the Son of David, in Jerusalem, ch. 10, 46-13, 36; Section VI: The Exit of JEsu, His Suffering, Death, Resurrection, ch. 14-16, 8. The non-original conclusion of Mark, ch. 16, 9-20. The interpretation itself, as far as the linguistic, historical, etc. is concerned, is detailed and **up to date,** but as far as the doctrinal yield is concerned, in many cases, e. g. p. 350, it is rather meager and scanty. Nor is the interpretation always clear and dogmatically in accordance with the analogy of faith, e. g., pp. 128. 300. 334. Wohlenberg does not pronounce **ex professo** on the inspiration of Mark; but that he does not hold to the inerrancy of the same is evident from the fact that he sometimes raises difficulties by the supposition of an "error of memory" (p. 38) or a "pardonable error" (pp. 93. 181. 374). Concerning the conclusion of the Gospel, Wohlenberg agrees with the opinion of D. Zahn's opinion, according to which the author of vv. 14-18 is "Ariston, the presbyter," whose name in an Armenian gospel book of the year 989 stands behind Mark. 16, 8 in red letters. About the much sought-after Aramaic-written "λόγια-source" D. Wohlenberg judges p. 27: "It is to be expected, however, that the precipitating attempts to get hold of that alleged 'source'-it is, after all, already not only published, but even annotated-despite all the sagacity and erudition of its authors or advocates, will prove as futile as the wandering of a caravan towards a spring of water which a **mirage** has presented to it." Wohlenberg dismisses the numerous hypotheses that distinguish layers in Mark's Gospel, which originated independently and were finally collaborated by a redactor, by saying, "We can let these hypotheses stand. They fail already because of the consideration that according to the quite reliable testimony of Papias, the apostle John, at least around the year 80, knew in Asia Minor a Gospel of Mark based on Peter's memories, the peculiarity of which, as characterized by him, fits our canonical Mark very well .

**Concise church history for students**. Especially for use in repetitions. By **Lic. theol.** H. Appel. Part I: Ancient Church History. Part II: Church History of the Middle Ages. With various tables and maps. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price for Part I: M. 2.80, for Part II: M. 3.80.

In the first part of this church history, Appel offers in 170 pages the great material of church history of the first six centuries in crowded brevity, precise form and clear arrangement. Two samples may follow for the characteristics of the book. In the section on Augustine's theology Appel says (p. 118): "All mankind is a **massa perditionis**, subject to the dominion of **concupiscentia** and death. Man is utterly incapable of good; even the virtues of the pagans can only be regarded as brilliant vices. Man possesses a **liberum arbitrium** only in so far as he can sin with his own will. Good comes solely and exclusively from grace. The process of salvation begins with the eradication of ignorance through the awakening of faith. Faith, according to Augustine, is assent to the truth proclaimed. It is not, as with Paul, in its very essence, trusting devotion to God. So also in Augustine faith does not work justification. At most he can ask for it. This itself is likewise differently conceived than in Paul, not - righteousness (forgiveness of sins), but = justification (expunging of sins). Justification consists in the infusion of love, in the transformation of man. Faith is justifying only when it operates through love. Justifying grace works **irresistibly** (**gratia irresistibilis**) and is otherwise

than the helping **gratia which** Adam enjoyed and which could be rejected. The perseverance of man in salvation (**donum perseverantiae**) is also an effect of grace. On the other hand, it cannot be argued that grace does not overcome all **vocati.** God does not want to make all blessed. He has, out of **massa perditionis, in** order that his grace may remain grace, predestined only individuals to beatitude, and it is only with these that the calling is successful." In the remarks on the claims of Rome to the primacy we read: "Leo I the Great, 440-461, is the first true pope, inasmuch as with this title, which was formerly attached to all bishops, and which since about 500 the Roman bishops have claimed exclusively for themselves, the thought of the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome is connected. 1 Leo was the Cyprian of the papacy. As Cyprian had founded the Church on the college of bishops, so Leo made its existence dependent on the Roman bishop, a. Hitherto, on the Roman side, it had been emphasized in the main only that Peter had first received episcopal authority, and that the other apostles had received it from him. And it was presupposed that all that Peter had received had also been granted to them. According to Leo, Peter had something in advance of the other apostles, which he did not and could not communicate to them, b. It was precisely on this plus, which had become Peter's, and through him alone was conferred on the Roman bishops, that Leo founded the existence of the Church. Peter did not possess, like the rest of the apostles, a part of the fullness of Christ's power, but possessed it wholly. As Christ is the cornerstone, so Peter is the rock of the Church. He is Christ's vicar. c. Even according to the theory of Innocent I, it might seem purely accidental that the Roman bishop should be considered the proper successor of Peter. For Innocent justified the primacy of Rome simply on the ground that Peter had stayed here longer than at Antioch. Leo showed why Peter had to make Rome his episcopal see. Because Rome had been the head of the world, the head of the church had to rise here as well. 2 Leo really ruled the West. When the metropolitan Hilarius of Arles wanted to become independent of Rome, Leo deposed him as Roman vicar and metropolitan and obtained an edict from Valentinian III in 445 by which the Gallic bishops were subordinated to the Roman See. In this the emperor referred to a forgery of the wording of can. 6 of Nicaea, which in the new version had the heading: **De primatu ecclesiae Romanae** and began: **Ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum**. (Thus, the oldest ecclesiastical legal bases for the Roman bishop's claims to primacy are: 1. the genuine can. 6 of Nicaea, 2. the can. 3 of Sardica, 3. the forged can. 6 of Nicaea.) Among all Roman bishops, Z. Leo also first exercised a decisive influence on the Orient. Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople appealed to him at the very Synod of Robbers in 449, and at Chalcedon, 451, Roman dogmatics triumphed. It is true that here the resolution was renewed that Neurom should have the immediate precedence of honor after Altrom, but Leo's protest against it made such an impression that the emperor and patriarch soon withdrew this provision. 4 In Leo the Roman Church embodied itself as the protective power for Romanism and ancient culture. It is a legend that he went to meet Attila and induced him by his venerable appearance to repent. But he certainly took part in the negotiations which led to the departure of the king of the Huns. And in 455 Leo ensured that the Vandals did not completely destroy Rome. He could not prevent the sack of the city." Least satisfying is the section on early Christianity. The second part of Appel's Ecclesiastical History has already appeared, which treats in 292 pages the "Ecclesiastical History of the Middle Ages," the discussion of which, however, we defer to another time. F. B.

The Religious Will. A contribution to the psychology and practice of religion. By **Lic.** E. Pfennigsdorf. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 5.80.

First, this book (pp. 1-18) deals with the psychological methods: the experiment, introspection, and statistical method of the Americans James and Starbuck, who here and repeatedly in the book are not a few

Feathers must fly. The first main part describes the "peculiarity of religious volition" as distinguished from religious cognition and feeling, and also as distinguished from moral volition and volition in hypnosis, treating also of the modifications: Desiring and willing, craving and yearning in religion. The second part (pp. 79-212) treats of the conditions and norms of religious willing, and establishes such religious norms of preference as are inherent in the will itself: 1. Religious value is to be preferred to religious unvalue. 2. 2. more religious value is preferable to less religious value. 3. being of religious value is preferable to not having it. 4. religious personal value is preferable to religious state value. 5. religious external value is preferable to religious personal value. 6. wanting religious value is preferable to wanting any other value, material enjoyment value, logical knowledge value, and also aesthetic and moral value. The third part (pp. 223-266) treats of willing 1. before per conversion, 2. in conversion, and 3. in sanctification. The fourth part (pp. 271-331) draws the inferences for religious practice in public preaching and religious instruction. - **Lic.** Psennigsdorf is an apologist, and in this writing, too, he is interested in explaining, or at least making somewhat plausible and conceivable, the mystery of conversion. He writes p. 244: "The 'how' of conversion, like the interaction of the supra-individual norms with the individual will, remains inexplicable to psychological observation. But the fact becomes more comprehensible to our thinking when it does not lie like an erratic block in the life of the soul, but can be traced as a process which is to be incorporated into a certain kind of psychic happening." But conversion is as much a divine miracle as the miracles of healing the sick and raising the dead. And just as we are not able to classify these miracles of Jesus reported in the Gospels with other physical and psychological events, or to explain them from the laws of nature and of the spirit, so also we are not able to classify and explain conversion, precisely because it is a **unicum** as a divine miracle, with any natural kind of psychological event. Of course, from his point of view, **Lic.** Pfennigsdorf also comes into conflict with the doctrine of conversion as presented in the second article of the Formula of Concord, namely, that conversion consists precisely in God making spiritually willing, willing, and thus also able to will, out of men who spiritually do not want and also only cannot want. Pfennigsdorf's exposition is transparent and clear, and easily comprehensible to anyone who is somewhat familiar with the questions which the newer psychology presents for discussion. F. B.

**From my childhood.** Memories of my youth by Margarete Lenk. Price, hardcover: 24. 1.75.

**Black and white and other stories** by Margarete Lenk. Price, hardcover: 80 Pf.

These two youth writings by the justly famous and widely read youth writer Margarete Lenk, published by Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau i. S., are herewith warmly recommended. F. B.

**The Sins of the Popes in the Mirror of History**. By Dr. Th. Engert. Complete in eight deliveries. Published by Krüger & Co, Leipzig. Price per delivery: 75 Pf.

This writing by the Catholic Modernist Dr. Engert is supposed to be a response to the Borromeo Encyclical of Pius X. In the "Preface" we read: "The Pope and the papacy stand high and holy before the Catholic people. Some have heard of one or another of the bad popes, but these are considered to be vanishing exceptions, especially because immorality is understood to mean almost only sexual debauchery. But in the good press and in the ecclesiastically approved textbooks, in sermons and catechesis, only the good and undeniably great merits of the papacy are always emphasized. When a professor of ecclesiastical history describes a monster, like Alexander VI, in all his depravity, he is publicly called a seducer

of the priestly offspring, those who shortly afterwards are to break the bread of truth to the people. Under such circumstances it might well be justifiable to cast for once, systematically and as objectively as possible, a bright light even on the moral dark sides of the Popes." In the "Introduction" Dr. Engert says: "But has it never occurred to the governor of the Lord that it is a sacred moral duty of pastors to seek the full truth before they speak to the notch? Ter Vatican possesses one of the greatest libraries in the world; might not the Pope, if he had truth at heart, have tested his judgment of the Reformers and the Reformation, before he spoke, by the judgment of great, leading Catholic historians? His historical and moral judgment on the Reformation and its leaders testifies to such grotesque ignorance, to such elementary ignorance of the Catholic Church of that time, of the driving motives and forces of the Reformation, that the reasonably educated man stands amazed before this fact. Can it be only ignorance, only naivete, that speaks thus? Is it not ill will, or at least blind fanaticism?" Further, "Is she" (the Roman Church by the Popes) "yet brought up in this delusion, that all who dare and sway to contradict the ecclesiastical authorities belong to the brood of Satan, capable of the most shameful vices. Now let it be shown to the people that where the alleged successors of the Prince of the Apostles stand, there is not purity and virtue, not constant fidelity to the faith, nor honest love of the truth. We will beware of falsifying history, nor of imputing false motives. The golden, shining path of the Papacy is pointed out by the orthodox writers; we shall place by its side, as a supplement, that no less long by-road, where violence and coß, where perjury and falsehood, where error and heresy, where sensual ardor and voluptuousness have left their terrible traces." An actual judgment of this work can, of course, be made only after all the deliveries have appeared. F. B.

**CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AND SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. By *Augustus Schultze,* D. D., LL. D. Bethlehem, Pa**, Price: P1.75.

D. Schultze is president of **Moravian College and Theological Seminary in** Bethlehem, Pa. His Dogmatics thus sets forth the doctrine of the Brethren Church as it is held in America. The theologians of the Brethren Church in Germany have, as "Lehre und Wehre" reported last year, fallen into liberal waters. The present dogmatics hold fast to the evangelical standpoint and uphold the doctrine of the Trinity, of the deity of Christ, of reconciliation through Christ's substitutionary life, suffering and death, and other doctrines which the liberals tend to deny. But there is unfortunately no lack of points which make it easy for unbelief to penetrate, even in this American presentation of the doctrine of the Moravian Brethren. D. Schultze replaces the Berbalinspiration by a personal inspiration. He therefore does not profess the consistent inerrancy of the Scriptures. Yes, D. Schultze is of the opinion that the modern nebulous hypothesis and the Darwinian theory of evolution are not contrary to revelation, as long as one only holds to the fact that there is a God who has laid down the laws of this development. For the rest, D. Schultz's point of view is a pietistic-unionistic one. The presentation is an exceedingly simple, popular and clear one.

F. B.

**Lodge Religion**. A lecture delivered before the Lutheran congregations at St. Joseph, Mo. and submitted to print at their request by F. A. Mehl. Price: 5 Cts.

This useful lecture shows in 32 pages that the Masons, **Odd- Fellows, Red-Men, Ancient Order of United Workmen, Knights of Pythias, United Order of Foresters, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Eagles, and Modern Woodmen of America** deny the Triune God and the doctrine of blessedness by grace through faith. To be obtained is the paper by Rev. F. A. Mehl, Sylvan Grove, Kans. The surplus will go into the benevolent fund. F. B.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**Prof. A. F. Hoppe has** been awarded the degree of Doctor of Theology **honoris causa by the faculty here.** The diploma reads as follows: "The undersigned faculty of Concordia Seminary at St. Louis in the State of Missouri this day confer the degree of Doctor of Divinity honoris causa upon the venerable Professor A. F. Hoppe, who in many years of activity has begun the new revised stereotype edition of the works of D. Martin Luther according to the plan of the J. G. Walch edition, which was commissioned by the Ministry of the Missouri Synod in 1880. Walch's edition, has now happily completed the title and dignity of Doctor of Theology in joyful recognition of his undaunted diligence shown in this great work and his zealous consideration of the newer Luther research; and it connects with this tribute of guilty honor at the same time the heartfelt thanks to God, who has graciously allowed such a highly important and for the Lutheran Church especially of our country so beneficial enterprise to succeed. St. Louis, Mo., October 31, 1910. F. Pieper. G. Stöckhardt. L. Fuerbringer. Bro. Bente. Geo. Mezger. W. H. T. Dau. E. A. W. Krauß. " F. B.

**Miscellaneous from the Lutheran Church.** 1. According to D. Lenker, the Lutheran Church throughout the world has 38,102 pastors, 60,385 churches, 21,000 deaconesses, and 76,000,000 baptized members, of whom 50,000,000 are German, 7,000,000 Swedish, 4,000,000 Norwegian, 3,000,000 Danish, 4,100,000 English, 3,100,000 Finnish, 1,100,000 Estonian, 400,000 Hungarian, 1,600,000 Latvian, 500,000 Slovakian, 500,000 Polish, 200,000 French, 100,000 Dutch, 72,000 Icelandic, 50,000 Bohemian, 10,716 Lappish, 412,000 Asiatic and 431,000 African. I wonder how D. Lenker arrived at these numbers? In Minnesota, one in three church members is a Lutheran; in Wisconsin, one in four; in Pennsylvania, one in eight. 3. The ***Encyclopedia Americana*** counts in Chicago 69 Lutheran and 56 German Protestant churches. But the fact is that there are 153 Lutheran churches in Chicago, but no "German Protestant" churches. The "German Lutheran" writes on page 53: "We have before us the last number of the 'Zeuge und Anzeiger', in which more than 16,000 dollars are acknowledged, which were sacrificed almost exclusively by the German Lutheran congregations belonging to Missouri in Greater New York in one month for the building of the college in Bronxville. Should we not also rejoice in such deeds and such sacrifices, which are almost unheard of in the history of the Lutheran Church in this city? "5 **Luther College** at Decorah, Iowa, will celebrate its fiftieth anniversary in 1911. To a fund of $250,000, railroad magnate Hill has pledged $50,000, if the balance will be raised by the Synod, which has now also already set about this task. 6. the Sunday-schools of the General Synod have raised §200,000 for mission in the last 26 years, of which $37,000 has been raised in the last two years. 7. The Augustana Synod, at its last meeting, also protested against the introduction of dancing and the employment of dancing teachers in the State schools. 8. Prof. Reu is

was appointed Doctor of Theology by the University of Leipzig because of his writing: "Sources for the History of Church Education in the Protestant Church of Germany between 1530 and 1600." 9 The ***Journal and Messenger*** says that the parochial schools of the Lutherans had the
Effect that other denominations had little influence on Lutheran youth and that one could not reach them "with the gospel of spiritual rebirth," i. e. with the rapturous rsvival and emotional conversion. A fine praise of the church school! Unfortunately, however, the incalculable blessing of this institute is not recognized by most in the Lutheran Church. The "Lutheran Zion Messenger" writes: "Among the many churches and sects in our country is one that calls itself the '**Living Church**'" and boasts of having received many members and preachers from other church fellowships in the last 25 years! The "**Living Church**", which the "Zionsbote" considers a new sect, is a leaf of the Episcopal Church. So it is one sect less than the "Zion messenger" thought! The ***Christian Advocate*** writes: "'**Hold, the Fort,' written a few years ago, is sung no more, but 'A Mighty Fortress is Our God,' written by Luther 380 years ago, is sung by more people every year. And why? The one is sentimental, vague, vapid, unreal. The other derives its reality, power, and inspiration from the God it glorifies.**" It means no praise for English Lutheran congregations when they prefer superficial cult songs and tunes to old core Lutheran hymns and chorales in their worship services. According to the ***Lutheran, the*** Jubilee meeting of the Icelandic Synod in Winnipeg was also attended by D. Gerberding of **Chicago Seminary**, D. Jacobs as **fraternal delegate** from the Council, and D. Stub, who brought greetings from the Norwegian Synod. The ***Lutheran*** writes (p. 759): "'**The question of uniting with the General Council raised a lively discussion. A committee was appointed to explain to the people the rules and usages of the General Council, and to answer any questions pertaining thereto, in the church papers, so that the Synod may be ready, if possible, to take definite action at the next meeting.**" 13. to a statement of the ***Lutheran Herald,*** the
English paper of the Norwegian Synod, against Union services with General Conciliation, the ***Lutheran*** remarks***:*** if you stick to it, you will be
can never unite. Does the ***Lutheran*** mean to say: Unity in
the disputed doctrinal points is unattainable; if, therefore, these points are not declared a priori to be indifferent to the community of prayer and faith, is union impossible? But is this the meaning of ***Lutheranism?***
God has not commanded us to bring about external unity at any price, but to teach and confess divine truth, even if this should cause external unity to fall apart. 14 The "Lutherans" of the United Synod (Schmidtians) protest against communal services with pastors of the General Synod. The Iowaians stand in a similar way. Now what is the ***Lutheran***'s verdict here***?*** The fact is that
Missourians from the Concilitarians, Schmidtians, and Iowans, than the Concilitarians from the General Synod. With us it is a question of conscience and principle; with the concilitarians it is essentially a question of prudence and expediency. F. B.

**Praise of the Lutheran Church.** The ***Newark Evening News*** writes: "**Amid the general turmoil and uncertainty of religious beliefs the Lutheran Church has gone steadily on her way; her scholars are keenly alive to what is going on, but singularly committed to the preaching of the strictest type of evangelical doctrine.**" Relatively true. No church in America has been less troubled by liberalism than the Lutheran church. But there is no lack of troubling symptoms in the Lutheran Church either. Admittedly, where these symptoms are most evident, they are least recognized. In its number of March 16, the ***Lutheran World*** also praised***:*** "The merit of the Lutheran Church in America is this: in none of its churches is a mutilated gospel preached, and by all the inspiration of Scripture is represented. **"While we do not bind ourselves to any special theory of inspiration, we do agree to the doctrine of the full and complete inspiration of the Bible.**" But the quoted words already indicate that one must make quite a few deductions from this praise. And the fact is that even in the Lutheran Church in America there are theologians who no longer hold to the inerrancy of Scripture. After all, in the General Synod the Bible is openly interpreted and corrected according to the sciences, e.g. according to the doctrine of evolution! And when, especially in American Lutheran papers, it is taught that conversion and salvation are in some respects not dependent on God's grace alone, but also on the conduct of man, this too can no longer be called an unmutilated gospel. That the ***Lutheran World*** has taken its mouth quite full is also evident from the fact that, for example, Dr. Delk has still not made any statement about his church fellowship in the Jewish Temple with Jews and Unitarians, nor has anything been announced to date about any intervention on the part of the officials of the General Synod. It should also be remembered here that the representatives of modern theology who left the Icelandic Synod last year claimed the right to interpret the Bible by analogy with their "religious consciousness". F. B.

**The Formula of Concord and the Lutheran World.** Until now, the General Synod wanted to know little or nothing about the Formula of Concord. Well known are the attacks that D. Richard directed against this confession until the end, without anyone having made an attempt to put a stop to it in the General Synod. And like Richard, the ***Observer*** seems to be still standing today. In the ***Lutheran World,*** however, the voices in favor of this symbol are increasing. In this interest, it also tells of the late Presbyterian D. Howard Crosby: who had once read from the Formula of Concord in a pastoral meeting And then declared, "**Had the Westminster Confession but been as scriptural, accurate, and moderate as that, what trouble would have been saved to the Presbyterian Church**!" Likewise, the ***World*** proudly reports D. Greene of Princeton: in the "**Bibliotheca Sacra,**" Greene had presented the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, that before conversion the will of man is but **subjectum convertendum to** grace, declaring, "**All this is well expressed in the Lutheran Formula of Concord, which in this respect defines what may justly be called the creed of Christendom.**" Hopefully, however, quite a few in the General Synod can now be induced to study the Formula of Concord diligently, so that to them

the theology of them becomes flesh and blood. If it remains the case that the graves of the prophets are adorned with a number of wreaths, then nothing will be gained for the General Synod. F. B.

**Alleged merits of the General Synod** were discussed by Prof. Neve some time ago in the "Z. B." under the heading: "Thoughts on the Confessional Question," with side glances and side blows at other Synods. Only what is put in quotation marks in the following are his words, for the rest we only highlight the main thoughts in our words. What, in his opinion, are the merits of his synod? The renunciation of "unity in the Spirit." It is lacking in the General Synod; "but it exists in the other synods only in appearance. (?) Admittedly, there is not one paper writing against the other, and at the synods, when papers are discussed, the deep-rooted but only timidly expressed objections must always be withdrawn when the "popes" have spoken. (?) The contradiction then rolls at home, or seeks comrades to whom it can "express itself in confidence." Fear shuts the mouth; freedom reigns in the General Synod. "We demonstrate quite openly that unity of spirit does not exist. But we are struggling for it." - Subordination of doctrinal discipline behind education. This is not to speak euphemistically of lack of doctrinal discipline. Against "fundamental errors" ("Unitarians, Universalists, **Christian Science,** and Adventists") "General Synod also exercises doctrinal discipline. But towards the errors of the Reformed church group, to which Christ and his merit still remain, one is lenient." (So it exercises discipline only outside the outermost church boundaries!) The heresies of the Reformed are not thus "declared to rightly exist"; the General Synod confesses Lutheran truth. But where in the English part of the General Synod individuals show themselves "influenced by Reformed doctrine, doctrinal discipline cannot be proceeded with." "It chooses here other ways of setting the erring right, namely, that of gradual education." Other Synods have here the abbreviated procedure of excommunication, but, as a careful exegesis of the Scripture passages in question (?) shows, with injustice. "In many cases, where the German would take hold, the American says in cool calmness, **Give him rope; he will hang himself.**" "Not that one wants to ignore the passages of Scripture referring to church discipline (!), but one hesitates a long time before taking action in the individual cases." (Where has this been done before?) - The nominal profession of the Augustana. "As a church body and officially it stands fully upon the Augsburg Confession . . . on the unaltered one." "Steps are to be taken to codify this declaration (!) and make it a part of the Constitution. (!) But notwithstanding such opinion of the General Synod as such, there are members in it, and evidently not a few (!) who inwardly stand otherwise." (But not merely inwardly, I suppose?) "They think that it is the duty of the General Synod to represent to the Concordia Lutherans a Melanchthonian Lutheranism, in which the distinctions between the Lutheran and Reformed church groups are kept fluid." This **status quo** is then explained from the history of the General Synod, namely the fifties, and from its being predominantly an English body. - The change for the better that has taken place. This is said to have been especially promoted by two circumstances, viz.

***The Lutheran World has been in a*** leading position for about fifteen years; it is now the sponsor's paper; the ***Observer is*** of little more importance. By the way, the ***Observer*** is being talked about as the people's paper. (As such it cannot be meaningless!) - No cause for resignation. In such a state of things the conservative element, especially in the German synods, has no cause to leave. Admittedly, the connection between the purely English and the purely German is somewhat unnatural and often embarrassing to the minority. "Some among us have wondered in moments of discouragement whether they would not have been happier, more contented, in a different union." Who must be led by God. The General Synod is, after all, Lutheran, and one must not leave the brethren who have made it more and more so. "God has given us our sphere of action here, and here we must remain." History shows this also in the wandering life of the Michigan Synod from the Wisconsin Council, out of it, and back into it again "with a **pater peecavi**." "Which, after all, can hardly be fine without a sacrifice of conviction." (How does N. know?) The Michiganders should have remained in the Council, and Löhe's pupils in the Ohio Synod, instead of going to Missouri, then Missouri would not have received the preponderance among the Gnesiolutherans. (Ei how wise that God had not known and willed this!) - The task of the General Synod. "The direction represented by the conservatives in the General Synod has still a mission in America." It consists in seeking a union of the different church bodies on the present confessional basis of the General Synod, with the exclusion, for instance, of the more strictly confessional synods and the Evangelical Synod as it now stands. But a union with the Reformed without doctrinal adjustment is rejected (Why? Are they worse than the present minority of the General Synod? Can they not be educated at the same time?), though the English occasionally hold church fellowship with them nevertheless. "The Germans place themselves on the 'Galesburg Rule.'" "But there are cases where preaching in non-Lutheran pulpits is not a denial of one's position." "Strictly speaking, we stand on the 'Acron Resolutions' as an interpretation of the Galesburg Rule." Only communion should be denied to the Reformed. - All of this is reasoning against God's clear Word. That is why one wisely does not measure this position against Scripture. Thus one whitewashes a dwelling-house built of pleasure with empty words, and imagines that one really dwells beautifully in it. Th. H-n.

## II. Abroad.

**Alfred Götze**, the long-time collaborator on the Weimar Luther edition, **says about** Luther as **a man**: "With a lively interest and an open eye, not with a lowered gaze, as the rule of the order presupposes, Brother Martin wandered through the lands; through ups and downs, which the miner's son and prince's advisor knew equally well, his world remained an open book to him, in which he never tired of reading. A happy memory keeps his mother's rhymes and the jokes of his youth alive for him into old age; his sense, trained on the popular, finds sounds,

which sonorously continue the lightly disturbed manner of those sayings and fairy tales without a note of abuse; the humour which strikes his ear from there provokes a hearty and vigorous laugh from him. Beside the partiality with which he confronts and succumbs to the superstition which dominates the age, a fresh originality of observation and a cheerful freedom even towards the sacred always surprises anew, whereas the gripping power of speech to call all this suitable and to paint it in such a way that through four hundred years it has retained colour and contour in unfaded features, may not and should not be called surprising in our hero."

**"Did the state-church correspond to Luther's ideal?"** In answer to this question in the "Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche" (Journal for Theology and Church), P. Drews, according to the "Chr. W.", also states the following thoughts: "From the beginning, Luther had only granted the right to speak and act in the church to the 'truly believing Christians' and thus also only to the 'truly believing authorities'. In his writing 'An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation' (To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation), Luther, in his naïve optimism, trusted this attitude to the emperor and the nobility. After the Diet of Worms, he buried the hope of such a Christian reform from above and expected the new construction only from below, so that the true Christians of the individual localities would have had to join together to form new congregations, which would then have had to form a larger ecclesiastical community, but the sovereignty of the country would not have had to exercise any rule, but only to render assistance, to give the congregations the opportunity for their education, and to grant them protection and support. According to this view, church authority lay only with the congregations of the faithful and their representatives, the pastors. Luther's ideal had always been that which he had expressed in the preface to the 'German Mass': the true believers separated from the unchristian masses, united in closer voluntary fellowship with the simplest worship, earnest discipline and intensive practice of love. Only with pain, never having lost his ideals, he had submitted to the later order of things, compelled by the hard facts. The sovereign church regiment, he said, was himself partly to blame for the hardship, but he had always borne it only as unavoidable."

**In order to review the text of the revised Bible,** the German Protestant Church Committee appointed a commission, which reported at its last meeting. The "Theologische Blätter" remarked: "So the revised Bible itself must now be revised again, after this revision itself has not yet been done for so long! May one at least write the words properly in the new edition; e.g. not say: Carry (!) the ark of the covenant, but: Carry the ark of the covenant (Jos. 3, 6), and not: Thou givest to the priests, but: Thou commandest the priests; not set receive, but receive, not two, but two! It is truly believed that the gentlemen who have revised are two centuries behind, because they impose such old Frankish language on the Bible! They have changed where they ought not to change, and what they were allowed to change they have not done! What an inverted world! Now one must indulge in 'laborious and time-consuming work' to make amends for the follies committed. May the commission which the Protestant Church Committee has appointed not add new forgeries to the old!"

**False dichotomy.** D. Ihmels says in the "A. E. L. K." p. 55: "We certainly have not dogma, but revelation, not doctrine, but gospel to preach. The very dogmatics represented here" (by Ihmels) "will want to emphasize this with all emphasis. If anyone, it knows that man would not be helped by a doctrine. How strange, for instance, if someone wanted to entertain a drowning man with all sorts of good doctrines! The lost man would feel the same way if someone wanted to teach him good doctrines, and he would have to begin to come out of his lostness. Everything in him does not call for good teachings, but for a saving deed. We know, not doctrines, only God's revelation can save and make blessed." As if revelation, gospel were not dogma, doctrine! And as if anything could save the poor sinner but the doctrine of justification! Ihmels seems to suppose that only that is doctrine, when the sinner is told how he himself must begin to do it in order to be blessed. The saving faith, as our confession so often emphasizes, is the knowledge of Christ. But how else is this to be given to man than by the doctrine of Christ and His work?

F. B.

**The Hanover Evangelical Lutheran Free Church,** at its meeting this year, amended the paragraph of its Church Order on marriage, adopted last year, as follows: "The marriage ceremony before God's altar is not to be regarded as a blessing of the church, but as the conclusion of Christian marriage by God's word, and takes place according to Luther's order of marriage as per the Agende, as bride and bridegroom are conjugally joined in the name of the Holy Trinity. In the change of this marriage ordinance on the part of the Hanoverian regional church we see, with our fathers, a violation of the second and eighth commandment. For the action of the regional church gives the appearance of a marriage, which it is not, nor should it be." The Hanover Free Church does not seem to be able to separate itself from its favorite error, that a real marriage comes about only through church marriage. The "Saxon Free Church" rightly remarks: "We Free Churches only fulfil our task, which God has given us in this time of apostasy and confusion, if we remain in all things solely with the word of God, without deduction and without addition, that is, if we do not make a divine foundation of what God has not expressly endowed. But He has endowed marriage, not marriage, which is only public, solemn, and therefore by no means superfluous and to be despised, but yet only confirmation of the marriage covenant made in lawful betrothal for the conscience."

**P. Strecker repents and makes amends for having handled church discipline.** The "Reformation" writes: "Punishment for church discipline. We read in the 'Schlesw.-Holst. K.- u. Sch.-Bl.' the following: Under the headline: "Apology from the pulpit", the press publishes the case of Father Strecker Grone near Göttingen who was sued by the consistory for handling the strictest church discipline, whereby the plaintiffs threatened mass resignation from the regional church, and that he, on the basis of negotiations between the church council and representatives of the government, made apology from the pulpit on a Sunday and promised the congregation to serve it in the future by avoiding all vehemence and severity. But in spite of all-

the Grone congregation seems to want to insist on a transfer of the pastor. It is a difficult thing about church discipline. It is only possible in the national church in a strict form where the majority of the congregation covers the pastor - where is that still the case? - and where the authorities stand up for him - and where do they do so?' " In spite of this ignominious bondage, as a pastor must repent of having acted according to God's Word, the Positives boast of the liberty and independence which the State Church guarantees them, and answer the question, "Why do we remain in the State Church?" with a "God wills it!" F. B.

**Concerning the coming separation of spirits,** Dean Römer writes in the "E. K. B.": "The new teaching must learn to speak a new language, which no longer, as now in the time of transition, takes the traditional word pictures and the sanctified ideas of the past as its starting point and makes them a deceptive shell for many listeners. Once this last consequence has been drawn, then it will be obvious to everyone in the congregation, as it already is to very many: the two directions have two different foundations, two different objects of faith, two different aims in life, which, though they touch each other in many respects, are nevertheless essentially independent of each other. D. Bezzel is undoubtedly right: The coming times are not days of refreshment; the congregation is preparing for decisive battles for the good of salvation. Appeals to historical law and the guaranteed protection of the confession will not be successful. There is no doubt that the outcome will be the same as in all decisions of world history: neither historical tradition nor established law will decide, but the living man will be right. It is almost certain that the liberal direction will win: the leading press far and wide is fighting for it with great unanimity, from the fiercest enemies of all faith to the apologists of a culturally purified religious worldview. From the prevailing spirit of the age the modern theological and religious trend was born, and therefore the spirit of the age cannot deny it. The slogan of liberal clergy and theology is loudly and confidently everywhere: We remain in the Church and in the ministry and demand freedom of preaching as appointed servants of the Church even for the most radical modern dogmas. If the modern trend achieves this sooner or later, then, according to our conviction, the Church is destroyed in its innermost essence, and the only thing left for us to do is to depart from it quietly and earnestly, without resentment, and in the confidence of Abraham (Heb. 11:8). For whom should we resent, when it is natural departure of that which has its life-roots in the spirit of the present world?" But how many more Christians will be vexed, and fall into the arms of unbelief, before the positive will resolve to consult no more with flesh and blood, and depart from Babel? F. B.

**That the liberals take an untenable position**, the liberal "Berliner Zeitung am Mittag" thus lets itself be heard about: "Liberal discussion speakers, mostly clergymen, have made the attempt to build a bridge between churchianity on the one hand, and between a view which either denies the historical Christ altogether, or recognizes him only as a man. But it must be held against them that with the Sonship of God the Christian doctrine as such stands and falls, and

that you cannot build bridges between world views of which only one can be true. In this orthodoxy is a thousand times right, that there is no third. If it is irreconcilable here, it is only consistent, just as it must be irreconcilable with the scientific monism that denies the history of creation. In matters of conscience one should make no compromises, and it would be desirable for religious liberalism not to make them either, for they only serve to blunt consciences and weaken the vigor that urges confession. Every ideal cause must have its confessors, and its martyrs too."

**From Hamburg comes the complaint:** "The liberals are ruining our church to the ground. The services of liberal pastors are becoming more and more deserted; the churches of the liberal clergy are almost without exception puny in attendance. The number of 100 adults is almost never reached in the huge houses of worship; in one main church, which seats about 1400, on ordinary Sundays 40, 50, or at most once 90 adults have been counted. And in a large church hall with 300 seats, on one Sunday, including the "official" people, there were 16, on another 13. This is indeed bankruptcy. In contrast, the churches of faithful preachers, even if they are not great orators, are almost always full. There is a lively congregational life there, and great sacrifices are also made. The willingness to sacrifice of the often very rich 'liberals' looks sad." (E. K. Z.)

**The higher elementary schools in Baden** are attended by 12,358 Protestant and 9585 Catholic pupils, and yet the Papist influence strongly predominates. The "D. E. K." writes: "The teachers are controlled by the Catholic pupils, especially in German and in history lessons, as is evident from many complaints from parents. As a result, many a history teacher no longer dares to recite the history about the Reformation at all, but has a pupil read this passage from the history book. By the way: In the elementary schools of Baden the history from 1517 to 1648 is not treated at all, and while in the textbooks everything Protestant is avoided except for a twice incidental mention of Luther's name, quite well-behaved stories, respectively legends of monks, bishops and popes are told in consideration of the Catholic children. Also with regard to the treatment of theologians in the school service, there is no parity in the Baden school system. In the Karlsruhe meeting it was pointed out that the Protestant theologian leaves the church service when he enters the school service, while the Catholic theologian, by virtue of his **character indelebilis,** always remains a priest and subordinate of his former ecclesiastical superiors."

**Rule of Unbelief in the State Churches**. With reference to the continued blasphemies of modern preachers, such as Fischer in Berlin, Jatho in Cologne, and others, the paper "Licht und Leben" (Light and Life) makes the following observation: "So after all! although we still cannot believe it and also do not want to believe it. In the Protestant Church of Prussia every confession is released. One may believe what he will, of God, of the Holy Scriptures, of Jesus, of the Holy Spirit; when he has passed the prescribed examinations, he will be ordained.

and employed as a preacher of the Protestant church. It is said in the church order in § 1: The Protestant Church of Westphalia and the Rhine Province is founded on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the sole and perfect guide of its faith, doctrine, and life, and recognizes the continuing validity of its confessions. But for pastors and preachers this § 1 does not apply. They may have a guide of their faith, doctrine, and life, and choose which they will, and no confession applies to them, neither the Augsburg Confession, nor the Schmalkaldic Articles, nor the Lutheran or Heidelberg Catechism. They have no confession to follow; they are above the confession. They make their own confession according to their theology. Thus the most contradictory doctrines and creeds can be preached from the pulpit of the same Lutheran regional church, and no consistory, no General Superintendent, no Oberkirchenrat has to interfere. How long is this to go on? It cannot go on much longer. If Rome did not have too many blatant errors that contradict biblical truth, we would soon be tempted to say, "Come, let us return to Rome, there at least is unity of faith" (? D. Red.). "But the way is cut off from us for all time. Should there really be nothing left but a free church?" One recognizes, as "U. d. K." remarks in this connection, from this concluding remark again the shyness, even fear of the Free Church, which prevails in the national churches. (E. L. F. K.)

Personne, **the recently** appointed **Bishop of Linköping in Sweden,** has signalled his arrival in office in a most distressing way. In a "pastoral letter" addressed to the preachers of his convent, he explains his theological standpoint. Personne is a Unitarian; he openly denies the deity of Christ and thus the doctrine of the Trinity and the atonement through the God-man Redeemer. He appropriated his views of Christ, in contrast to the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, from Viktor Rydberg's book, Bibelns lära om Kristus. Rydberg's Christ is "idealmänniska." Christ's deity, Rydberg claims, is not taught in any New Testament scripture, not even in the Gospel of John. Rydberg's writing met with fierce opposition in the Lutheran Church of Sweden at the time. Bishop Beckmann, D. Lars Landgren, lecturer Martin Johansfon and others wrote against it. The new Bishop Personne declares that he has read all the writings directed against Rydberg, but must judge that Rydberg has Scripture on his side, while Rydberg's opponents are only able to argue from the standpoint of the Lutheran confession. - "Augustana," the organ of the Swedish Lutheran Church of our country, from which we take the above, turns with indignation against this omission of Personne's, and proves the anti-biblical character of the same in a long editorial. This paper deplores the fact that Personne did not reveal his true sentiments before the election of the bishop, and rightly denounces it as a gross ethical offence that one should "eat the bread of a church whose doctrine he denies." "Augustana" therefore "protests" "against the denial of our faith." Whether this will be of any use remains to be seen. But in view of the intimate relationship between the Swedish church in our country and the Swedish state church over there, the protest is perfectly justified.

justified and should be urged to the last consequence. The Personne case will no doubt be followed with great interest over here and over there. What the Lutherans in Europe need is a fresh, cheerful Los - vom - Staat movement. Under free-church conditions the Personne case would soon be settled. D.

**A priest from Austria wrote** in a Catholic newspaper: "In northern Bohemia the apostasy would not have caused so much damage if the people had had German priests who understood them, but unfortunately for many years Czech clergy were employed in purely German parishes for lack of priests. The Czech accent, among other things, makes the Catholic Church unpopular with the people, and when the German vicars came and the people heard pure German preaching and officiating again, they ran to them. Let us not deceive ourselves, we too are becoming stranger and stranger with our Latin prayers."

D. Dennert defines the **difference between the Monist League and the Kepler League as** follows: "There was a time when natural science was exploited for philosophical-religious purposes and it was believed that God could be proven from it. At that time, one wanted to support the belief in God through natural science; today, however, one wants to overthrow it through natural science. The Kepler Society now stands from the standpoint that both are wrong, and this because the two fields are entirely different and presuppose different experience. They are mutually neutral. One sees at once the fundamental difference between the Monist League and the Kepler League: the latter wants to prove from natural science that the 'central dogmas' of every religious view - God, soul, free will - are false; the latter considers this impossible, because natural science has nothing whatever to do with such matters of faith. The Kepler Society says: From the standpoint of the world-view one must be a pure agnostic in religious matters (i. e., say: I know nothing of this); this is the only justified and correct position of natural science. Thus every faith, may it be of a positive or negative kind, is given a free course, while the Monist League puts it in fetters. Free science and free faith must be the watchword of all prudent contemporaries. Neither science must be hindered by the side of faith, nor faith by the side of science. In the opinion of the Häckelian Monist League, the world-view can only be utilized atheistically; in the opinion of the Kepler League, on the other hand, the world-view can be developed into a theistic or atheistic world-view at one's own discretion, according to one's other experience of life. It therefore considers it to be the right of its members to have a personal theistic conviction. From this point of view, the Keplerbund emphatically demands both freedom of natural research and freedom of belief in God, while Häckelian monism, which formed the basis of the German Monist League, proclaimed not only lack of freedom, but even annihilation of belief in God." That the Kepler League makes a pernicious concession to unbelief when it admits that nature can also be interpreted atheistically is evident, e. g., from Rom. 1:18 ff. At its last meeting the Kepler Society declared that its purpose was the propagation of pure knowledge of nature (unmixed with philosophy and worldview). Is this

but really serious, then he must also reject, which, however, has not yet been done, the theory of evolution, which is neither a fact nor a necessary conclusion from facts, but a void hypothesis brought to the facts from the brain of the investigators. F. B.

**How man hates God is shown by the** following blasphemies which the missionaries in Berlin hear: "If there is a God, I hate him." "The God I worship is a beautiful girl." "My children shall go no more to Sunday school; I am the God of my sons, my wife is the God of my daughters." "Your God, Mr. City Missionary, has been dead a long time. Once you have nothing, he throws nothing down to you from heaven." "I'll baptize the little one myself, but with liquor." The city missionaries made 100,500 visits and distributed 124,000 scriptures.

**Jewish baptism movement**. The Jewish scholar Dr. S. Bernfeld in Warsaw writes about it: "The baptism movement has spread strongly in Germany and in some Austrian provinces in the last few years. Especially in the large cities and Jewish centres, in Berlin, Breslau, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Vienna, Prague, Berne, etc., the baptismal movement is spreading. These are very strange signs, which we must consider quite seriously. We find among them names from the best Jewish families. It seems that one branch after another is being cut off from the magnificent Jewish tree. The baptismal movement is now assuming a mass character." The reasons he gives are that "people want to live more easily," or "thereby to get into Christian society. In Germany and Austria many Jews are being baptized precisely out of religious feeling, out of religious thirst, out of sincere desire for God! What is this? How can a Jew leave the Jewish God, precisely out of conviction of faith, and seek another faith? But the true German Jew has long since forgotten his old Jewish God. He knows nothing of the 'Torah'. Hebrew is Chinese to him. And there the religious-minded Jew goes about seeking a true religious mood. He does not find it among the rabbis and reformers, but he does find it among the Christian clergy, and that is why he goes there. But it is very painful, because especially now there is a religious mood among the German Jews, a new religious revival, and precisely this does not bring the German Jews to Judaism, but leads them to Catholicism and Protestantism." (G. d. G.)

**"Union de los Catolicos."** This union, formed by the hierarchy in Spain, demands, according to the "Frankfurter Ztg.": 1. That the practice of all non-Catholic worship in public places and all non-Catholic schools be forbidden; 2. That the teaching in all universities, grammar schools, seminaries, as well as in all public and private elementary schools, be directed entirely according to the teachings of the Catholic Church; 3. That the clergy be free from taxation and military duty, as well as from the duty of witnessing in court and from condemnation by the secular tribunal without episcopal permission; 4. That every non-Catholic association, or one not agreeable to the bishops, be suppressed; 5. That young people of both sexes, from the age of puberty, may enter any order approved by the church; 6. That the bishops have the right.

to compel an executor to pay out a legacy bequeathed to the Church without the intervention of the civil authorities. - What the papists openly demand in Spain, they cautiously strive for in America and other Protestant countries. F. B.

**L'Oeuvre pour et panni les anciens Pretres**, the work for and among the former priests, whose director is the former priest and former itinerant preacher of the unfortunately defunct positive faith **Oeuvre des Pretres**, Mr. Léon Revoyre, has developed a successful activity since its existence. The Oeuvre **Oeuvre parmi les anciens Pretres** differs from the former **Oeuvre des Pretres** chiefly in the fact that it is not. Like the former Oeuvre parmi les anciens Pretres, which was presided over for many years by Father Picard of the Etoile Church in Paris, the Oeuvre parmi les anciens Pretres does not wish to serve the Protestant Church and lead priests leaving the Catholic Church to the sincere Protestant faith, but rather to serve all doubting priests without distinction of direction and only to foster a general Christian consciousness among them. Accordingly, the Board of Directors is composed of members of different persuasions and convictions. The work itself distinguishes between an activity among priests still in the Catholic parish and an activity among former priests. Of the latter, in the course of the last year (the first year of the existence of this Work), 86 have come into closer contact with its leadership, 61 through personal visits and 25 through correspondence; 22 former priests have received material support, seven have been admitted to the Home, and two are currently studying theology. Activity among priests still in office has extended to fourteen dioceses, and 8000 priests have been sent the ***Chretien libre***, the organ of this work, of whom only 80 refused to accept it. Eighteen priests still in office have entered into correspondence with the management of the work, and 32 have approached it by repeated visits; of these last 50 priests, 22 have since left the Catholic Church. Four cultist priests have received support from the Work, five officiating priests have been received as visiting guests, and three have been visited in their parishes by the Work's leadership. Particularly important assistance has been given to 26 priests, and more than twice that number have been helped occasionally. Thus, in the short time of its existence, this Work of Love has been able to do real good to 136 priests and former priests, both through material assistance and through sympathetic participation. The cultualist clergy, whom the work also takes care of, preside over the few congregations which since 1906 have organized themselves as Catholic parishes independent of Rome, in accordance with the law on the separation of church and state. One of them, M. Bourdery, has founded such a liberal Catholic congregation at Chantenay, near Nantes, whose worship approaches the Anglican rite, and has therefore aroused special interest in England. For a year, however, he has handed over this congregation to the former Catholic pastor Teulére, who has converted to the Protestant Church, and has now founded a Liberal Catholic mission in Paris, where, as formerly at Chantenay, he holds Liberal Catholic cults on Sundays, which have the special sympathy of the ***Chretien libre*** and its leadership. (Ref.)

**Prof. Nauhaus** gave the **following verdict on the success of the mission** in Kaiser Wilhelms-Land: "Before the mission (that is, the Neuendettelsauer) came to the country, the Kais, the inhabitants of the interior, were in a dismal state. Magic dominated life and traffic in such a way that every upswing was inhibited. If someone died, sorcery was to blame. The evil-minded neighbour who had cast the spell had to die. His hut was attacked at night, the unfortunate person was pierced with spears and then eaten. The blood revenge required further victims, and thus many a flourishing village was destroyed. These insecure conditions led to a special type of house construction: as people did not feel safe on the ground, the huts were built on trees. Ten years ago, many a giant tree had three or four huts in its crown. Due to the influence of the missionaries, these conditions changed radically in the course of a decade. The tree houses have disappeared and the huts are made of better, more durable material. In the past, the village was moved after each raid; therefore, the huts were made without care. Thanks to orderly conditions, the population is now on the increase, a pleasing fact to Europeans; for the economic future of New Guinea depends on the availability of an abundant native labor force."

**In a speech on gravestone art,** architect Kolbe said from the "Conference for ecclesiastical folk art": "In contrast to the often found tastelessness (overloaded and silent forms, unsuitable material, such as cement, glass and sheet metal, shiny black glass panels with gold lettering, impossible angels, glass blowing, sheet metal wreaths, badly distributed lettering, restless grids) he pointed out the requirements of a good gravestone: noble, simple, monumental forms, only the best figurative and ornamental decoration, well-distributed writing, skilful planting and - the most important - genuine material. The most suitable materials are granite, shell limestone, porphyry, coloured marble, hard sandstone, bronze and iron. Black syenite looks too gloomy, white marble too cold, at least in our climate; the combination of black polished syenite with white marble makes an unharmonious impression; polished granite shines too brightly. For the rest, it is all the easier to work for noble tombstones, since a good, noble tombstone is usually cheaper than the tasteless products of the artistically untrained stonemason.

**In the "Deutsche Literaturzeitung"** D. Lorenz writes: "As far as the value of Häckel's monistic philosophy is concerned, a cultural historian of later centuries who deals with our age will probably see the greatest world puzzle in the fact that Häckel's book could be appreciated by philosophers like Paulsen, by theologians like Loofs, by physicists like Chwolson. . . . The inability to think even a single philosophical thought to its conclusion took on a grotesque form in the ill-fated Welträtselbuch above the attempt to provide a coherent system. Hand in hand with this went an intolerable arrogance towards "university philosophy", whose representatives, insofar as they dared to arrive at results different from those of Häckel, were for this called by the flower of the cowardice of-

were suspected. Perhaps even greater was the ignorance and recklessness with which Häckel presumed to judge biblical criticism and church history, and to this was added a most embarrassing tendency to drag down what had been sacred for millennia into the mire of ugly anecdotes and low jokes. . . . Of course, Häckel was unable to answer the questions of the serious thinkers who critiqued his book. He was left only with the old evasion: He who cannot prove, resorts to the cudgel - that is, if that does not work, to cudgel-thick invectives! Häckel contented himself with branding his opponents as 'dishonest sophists', 'conceited fools' and whatever else, and quite openly expressed his conviction: only mere envy because of his success as a bookseller had caused them to attack him! It would probably be in vain to assure Häckel that none of these men would pay for their bookselling success with the price of having written the 'World Riddles' themselves."

**In the church of the birthplace of the Berlin philosopher Fr. Paulsen,** a memorial plaque has recently been installed, which has the following inscription written by Paulsen himself: "In memory of D. Dr. Friedrich Paulsen, born here in Langenhorn (Husum district) on 16. July 1846, where his parents were Paul Fr. Paulsen and Christine, née Ketelsen, his teachers Küster S. Brodersen and P. C. Thomsen, died at Steglitz near Berlin (on August 14, 1908), after having worked at the Berlin University for 33 years as a teacher of philosophy and pedagogy. Friend of truth and sound reason, enemy of lies and appearances, a supporter of the good cause, even of the non-victorious one, not too eager for the honor of the world, not in the wake of the will to power, loyal to his homeland, grateful to the parents and teachers of his youth, he lived in a time that held the opposite of all that, and therefore did not leave this world unwillingly in the hope of a better one." To these significant words we add the confession which Paulsen made at the tenth Ev. Social Congress: "All kinds of educators have been recommended to us in recent years: Schopenhauer, Rembrandt, etc. I would say: No, it can only mean: Jesus as educator of our people and of mankind!" Thus the "Old Faith." But whoever takes Paulsen's writings, which are also used in some American universities, will find that he was a pantheist and did not want to know anything about Christ's divinity in the sense of the Christian Church.

F. B.

**Of the propaganda of Islam**, which is also a danger to Deutfch East Africa because most of the sub-officials of the protection forces are "Moslemi", Die. Axenfeld: "The Mohammedan propaganda is fundamentally different from the Christian mission. Their chief weapon is not love, but violence, ridicule, superior contempt. Admission to Islam is made somewhat inconvenient by the payment of dues, submission to certain dietary laws, but a change of heart, an abandonment of favorite fancies, is not demanded. Even polygamy and sorcery may be retained by the converts. Here lies the solution to the riddle of why Islam is spreading so rapidly. But this means a grave danger, because the opinion that Islam is, as it were, a precursor to Christianity is fundamentally wrong. Through Islam

naive children of nature made sullen and closed; nay, they are morally corrupted by seduction to unnatural vices." And as to Germany's political interests in East Africa, Axenfeld remarks: "It is not true that Islam is a bearer of culture; it has taught neither house-building, nor agriculture, nor farming to the blacks, but it may well have formerly flooded the country with a flood of tears by its cruel slave trade, and sows suspicion assiduously against the whites, especially against the Christians. His hope for the future excites him to political sedition; for the proposition, what once belonged to Mohammed, that remains his undisputed dominion, is held by him as the supreme dogma of faith. If this be so, is not our precious colonial possession in constant political danger?"

**The change which the prohibition of opium** has brought about in **China is** shown by the following report: "Wheat, corn, beans, peas, rice, cotton, etc., have displaced the poppy from the fields; and the people who formerly lived by growing poppies now seem to get on much better with wheat, rice, etc. The price of rice and other foodstuffs had formerly risen so high that the people could hardly afford it; now the people can eat their fill at a fraction of the former cost. The price of rice and other foodstuffs had formerly risen so high that people could scarcely afford it; now people can eat their fill at a fraction of the former cost. Not long ago it was said that the suppression of opium meant the economic downfall of China. The exact opposite has happened. The towns and villages seem to be reviving. Old, crumbling houses are being rebuilt, new shops are being set up. The government is giving large sums of money for colleges, elementary schools, etc. Still more, the people are buying Bible portions and Christian Scriptures as never before. Doors are opening on all sides for missionary work."

**Dr. Cook writes of the mission among the Bagishu in Uganda**: "When we came here with Bishop Tucker six years ago, we were received with a hail of stones. The Bagishu were raw man-eaters; the men went entirely naked, the women wore only chains of kernels; the greatest immorality prevailed among them, which in many instances forms a part of their religion. And now these man-eaters learn to read and write, and pray to God in their language, so that one must exclaim: 'O what a depth of riches, both of wisdom and knowledge of God I'"

**The creed of the moderns** is thus formulated in the Bavarian "Korrespondenzblatt": "I believe in the all-loving Father God, who has made the world and everything that happens in it according to the laws of nature. I believe in Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary, who taught mankind to feel themselves the children of God, and in his person gave the highest example of true humanity, suffered under Pontius Pilate, crucified for his convictions, died and was buried, not bodily resurrected, but spiritually resurrected by the revival of his teaching, not ascended to heaven and not coming again to judgment. I believe in the holy spirit of human knowledge; I have no need of a Christian church, but only of a personal relation of my soul to God and to those like me; I have no need of forgiveness of sins; I believe in no resurrection of the flesh, but only in a survival of the human spirit after death." At any rate, liberals cannot rightly complain of this formulation. F. B.

# Doctrine and Defense.

**Volume 56. December 1910. No. 12.**

## A word more about the nature of faith.

The undersigned has been asked by some brethren to discuss once again "the nature of faith," which has already been treated in volumes 1904 and 1906 of this periodical, and especially the question whether such expressions as "longing for grace, yearning, desiring," "seeking forgiveness of sins, asking for it, getting it," "coming to Christ, to Christ," "to take hold of," "to take to oneself," "to draw to oneself," also describe faith in its beginning, at first justification, or only faith in its progress, faith in the state of grace, or, in other words, the essence of faith as such, or rather the fruit, consequence, and effect of faith. Since Huebener's secession, this question has been ventilated here and there in our circles.

First, some preliminary remarks. To the first. It is, to say the least, pure folly, if we are accused of synergism or majorism, because we have called justifying faith with Scripture, with our confession, with the doctrinal fathers of orthodoxy, a "work," that is, an inward work, an act of the will, **actus intellectus et voluntatis.** We have always testified clearly enough that in the formation of faith, in conversion, man is **purely passive, that** faith is only God's gift, work, and effect. We have also always emphasized that faith in **relatione ad justificationem is** purely passive, that as such, as **credere, it** contributes nothing to justification, that it is not the act, but only the object and content of faith that justifies man. The question is how to speak of the nature and essence of faith, whether it is right to describe faith as an inward movement and activity of man, as a movement and activity of his understanding and especially of his will.

Secondly. It is misleading to make a distinction between the first and the later faith, the faith in first justification and the faith in the state of justification.

difference. Wherever in Christian and ecclesiastical literature faith, by which we are justified and saved, is spoken of, one and the same thing is always meant, whether it be specifically faith according to its beginning or according to its continuation, or, as is usually the case, both faith, the **characteristicum of** the Christian, which extends from the beginning to the end of Christianity, and faith **in general,** as a whole. It would be quite confusing if by the same name, without the least intimation in the text of the discourse, different things were to be understood. The genesis, cause, and origin of faith, as well as the relation of the same to the justifying judgment of God, is always the same at every stage of faith. It is God alone who works and sustains faith. It is now and never the act of faith, even in the hour of death, but the object of faith alone, which procures for sinful man a gracious judgment from God. And so it is also in essence one and the same thing, one and the same faith, which begins with the first little spark in conversion, and then by God's grace steadily grows and increases. Not only in its first beginnings, but also in its fine progress, justifying faith as such is to be strictly separated and distinguished from that which precedes, repentance, and that which follows, the fruit of faith, sanctification, fear, love, trust, good works.

Justifying faith is in its essence, as the orthodox church has always described it, **notitia, assensus, fiducia,** namely, knowledge of Christ, assent to the gospel and its promises, trust in Christ and Christ's merit, in the righteousness established by Christ for all sinners and offered in the gospel. These three pieces are movements of the soul, acts of the mind and will. But it is also quite right to define faith briefly as acceptance, that is, as accepting, grasping the grace of God, the merit of Christ, the forgiveness of sins, the righteousness that is valid before God. For by recognizing, assenting, trusting, we take hold of the very objects of faith mentioned, and appropriate them to ourselves personally. Justifying faith is in every stage **nuda apprehensio**. We take Christ for ourselves and give him nothing. But this **accipere is,** according to its concept and essence, as our confession expresses it, a **velle et accipere** or a **velle accipere**. The faith, the trust, the taking is a receiving activity. And this **velle accipere,** if it be acknowledged even according to the wording, is indeed entirely emptied and devalued, if the **motus et actus mentis et voluntatis** denoted by the expressions mentioned in the entrance are excluded from the essence of faith.

Let us now once again visualize how the Holy Scriptures speak of faith. This material is so rich that we can

cannot exhaust it in one article. It is sufficient for us to examine more closely those passages of Scripture in which the expressions in question and other related expressions occur, in order to convince ourselves that by the latter faith itself, not a fruit of faith, or faith even in its first beginnings, is described, that they belong to the biblical concept of faith. At the same time we take into account the explanation of the Scriptural words in question in our Confession and in the writings of Lutheran fathers.

The most common biblical designation for faith is, as is well known, πίστις**,** ***πιστενειν***. Cremer registers the numerous passages of Scripture which strike here, and sums up the result of his investigation in the following sentence: "After all, the New Testament concept of faith ***(πιστενειν)*** contains three main moments which demand one another, though according to circumstances one or the other is especially prominent: convincing acknowledgment of the revelation of salvation, devoted fellowship (adherence), and finally confident trust, certain of its cause, in the God of salvation or in Christ." The resounding moment here is the **velle**, the act of the will. The knowledge of Christ, this **motus intellectus,** if it be wholesome knowledge wrought by the Spirit, becomes immediately the acknowledgment, assent, that man, to speak with our confession, gives his assent to the promise of the Gospel, and the assent culminates in confident trust. Yes, confidence, **fiducia** is the very **nervus rei**. Thus Cremer also defines the πίστις briefly thus: "On the whole we may conceive as a confidence cherished with conviction, which offers defiance to opposing contradictions." Suffice it to say that in the following discussion we shall sharply grasp and hold this fundamental meaning of faith, and observe what **motus animi are** summed up in **fiducia.** We will therefore refrain here from other designations of faith, which have been discussed in the earlier articles, such as that it is often called and described in Scripture and the Confession, for example, as obedience, obedience to Christ, obedience to the Gospel.

The aged patriarch Jacob interrupts the blessing he pronounces over his sons after Dan has received his portion with the words: XXXX XXXX XXXXXX. Gen. 49, 18. That is to say: Lord, I
wait, wait for your salvation; I long for your salvation. To this an ancient Jewish Targum remarks: "Yet not to the redemption of Gideon the son of Joash doth my soul look, for it is temporal; not to the redemption of Samson the son of Manoah doth my longing look, for it is temporary; but to the redemption which thou hast promised by thy everlasting word to accomplish unto thy people the seed of Israel. To your redemption, Jehovah, to the redemption of the Messiah, the Son of David... ...to the redemption...

aim my looking and my longing; for thy salvation, Jehovah, is an everlasting salvation." "O LORD, I wait for thy salvation!" This was a confident waiting, waiting, with which the dying Jacob claimed for himself also the redemption through Christ, which he had promised as a prophet to his sons in his saying concerning Judah. This was appropriation of salvation in Christ, **apprehensio Christi**. This was true faith, not first the fruit and consequence of faith. "Lord, I wait for thy salvation." With these words Jacob tore his eyes away from his sons and directed them to the God of salvation, to the Messiah, and declared before God how his heart longed and longed for Christ, the salvation of God. And this was true faith. The ancients defined **fiducia**, the chief moment of faith, in more detail: **fiducia in corde et voluntate**. This is faith, when the heart's desire, longing, yearning, is directed toward Christ and his salvation. He that believeth saith in his heart, "JEsus, JEsus, nothing but JEsus shall be my desire and my aim." "A thousand times I remember thee, my Redeemer, and desire thee alone, my Redeemer." "So also my desire, dearest JEsu, is only for thee; let me cling faithfully to thee, give thee for my own." The expression XXX meets us still more often in similar connection as Gen. 49, 18 in the Old Testament. Thus, e. g., Isa. 60, 9: XXX XXX XX XX. There the conversion of the Gentiles, of which the connection deals, i. e., the beginning of faith, is described by the words, "The isles shall wait for me," shall desire me. Calov accurately explains the saying of the prophet: **Insulae evangelio meo crediturae sunt**. Accordingly, our Confession designates the first spark of faith which God has kindled in the heart through the Gospel, as **desiderium gratiae divinae**, as longing for grace. Müller, Symb. B., P. 591. 601.

The other term, XXX, to seek, is closely related to this one. Isa. 55, 4-6 it is said, "Incline your ears, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live: for I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the certain mercies of David. Behold, I have set him for a witness unto the people, for a prince and a ruler unto the nations. Behold, thou shalt call Gentiles whom thou knowest not, and Gentiles that know thee not shall run unto thee, for the sake of the LORD thy God, and of the Holy One in Israel, who praiseth thee. Seek ye the LORD - XX - because he is to be found." Here the New Testament time of grace is described. Christ, the LORD, David's Son, is set in the midst of the Gentiles, and calls the Gentiles to Himself, and many run to Him. And now the call goes out to all the Gentiles: Seek the Lord, because he is to be found. Seek him, seek him out, run to him, that you may find him and that he may become your own. This is an invitation to accept Christ and His salvation, and this is the very essence of faith.

Calov remarks on this passage, especially v. 6: **Vocantur gentes ad poenitentiam et ad fidem evangelii. Omnes homines invitat ad suscipiendum per fidem evangelium**. So he explains seeking, XXX, quite correctly by **suscipere per fidem evangelium**, "to receive the gospel in faith." A parallel passage is Isa. 11, 10: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, which is for a banner unto the nations, shall be sought after by the Gentiles. "XXX

XXXX XXX. Luther writes about this in his Scholien: **Exaltatio signi commovet gentes, ut eum quaerant. Elevatur signum per praedicationem evangelii. Quaerere significat credere**. In this, then, consists the conversion of the Gentiles, that is, the beginning of their faith, that they inquire after Christ, seek the Christ who is set before them in the preaching of the Gospel. In explaining Isa. 53:11, Luther characterizes **fides**, the essence of faith, in the following way: **Fides est viva cognitio, non tantum qua audio et narro, sed qua apprehendo, innitor et sector hanc cognitionem, quod intrat in cor, ut sperem et non dubitem ac acquiescam et confidam, quod Christus pro me passus sit**. According to Luther, **sectari,** "to seek," "to seek eagerly," "to pursue," "eifrig wonach trachten," is synonymous with **apprehendere, "**to seize," and **confidere**, "to trust."

The expression "seek", "seek forgiveness of sins" is used in our confession in the same sense. The Apology shows by the example of the woman ready to eat butter, Luk. 7, 47. 50, which is the real kind, the essence of faith, and that just in distinction from its fruits, as from love. "Now this is the faith which relies on God's mercy and word, not on works of its own. And if anyone thinks that faith can rely on God and its own works at the same time, he certainly does not understand what faith is. For a troubled conscience is not satisfied by works of its own, but must cry out for mercy, and can be comforted and uplifted by God's word alone." "The woman comes to Christ confident that she will obtain forgiveness of sin from him; that is, to know and honor Christ aright. For greater honor cannot be done to Christ. For this is called truly knowing the Messiah or Christ, and seeking forgiveness of sins from him. To hold the same of Christ, that is, to know and accept Christ, is to believe rightly in Christ." "But the service of the woman, that she should know her sin, and seek forgiveness of sin from Christ, this service Christ commendeth." M., S. B., p. 114. Yes, wanting to obtain forgiveness of sin from Christ, seeking forgiveness of sin from Christ, relying on God's mercy, rightly knowing and accepting Christ, rightly believing in Christ, these are all one and the same thing. And the very beginning of faith, conversion, consists in the fact that the conscience, awakened and terrified by the law, cries out for mercy and seeks forgiveness of sin from Christ.

seeks. This faith in the heart then proves itself, as the Apology continues to show with the example of the woman, through the fruits, through love and works of love.

And now we should not object to the expression, "Obtain forgiveness of sins from Christ," as a designation of faith. This does not exclude the fact that the forgiveness of sins has been purchased and prepared by Christ and is offered to us in the gospel. By faithfully accepting the forgiveness offered in the Gospel, we draw it for ourselves from the Gospel, appropriate it to ourselves in order to comfort our conscience with it. Luther says in the Large Catechism, "Therefore all things in Christendom are ordered to obtain daily forgiveness of sins by word and sign, for the comfort and edification of our consciences, as long as we live here." M., S. B., p. 458. In the Latin text the "fetch" is rendered **auferre**, **ut quotidie meras condonationes auferamus. Auferre means to** take away for oneself, to carry away, to obtain. After Luther has noted in the explanation of the fifth petition that God has given us the gospel, in which is vain forgiveness, he continues, "But it is to be done that we recognize and accept such forgiveness. For since the flesh, in which we live daily, is such that it does not believe and trust God ... and thus lets comfort and confidence sink out of the gospel, it is necessary without ceasing that one should run here and get comfort to restore the conscience." M., S. B., p. 478. "To run to the gospel, and there fetch the consolation of forgiveness," is identical with the ordinary expression, "to know and accept such forgiveness." And this, after all, is faith itself, not first a consequence or fruit of faith. In both passages Luther is speaking of the daily forgiveness of sins. But the daily forgiveness is essentially the same as the first justification, and so the acceptance of forgiveness or faith is essentially the same thing here and there, and in both cases may also be called a fetching, taking away, carrying away, obtaining.

Jesus says: "I am the bread of life. He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst," Joh. 6, 35. Here "coming to Jesus" and "believing in Jesus" are obviously identical terms. Luther writes: "Therefore he alone giveth them to understand, saith: 'He that believeth on me.' This is a powerful gloss, that to come to Christ is to believe in Christ. . . . For to eat and to come to Christ; item, to believe in him, all these are the same." Of course, an inward, spiritual movement of the soul toward Christ is meant, that man, believing, turns his senses and thoughts, heart and will, to Christ, the Savior of sinners. Luther: "This coming, however, is not bodily, that one may go to heaven or beyond.

Clouds wanted to climb. Neither is the coming with hands and feet, but the heart cometh to God by faith. When thou hearest his word, and it pleaseth thee to cleave unto it, the heart goeth unto him." Of course the coming or faith only happens in such a way that the man is drawn by the Father, John 6:44. Luther: "He alone comes to me, and no one else feels the faith without which the Father draws to me. The drawing is . . . a friendly attracting and drawing to himself, just as an affable man draws people to himself, so that he is friendly and affable, and everyone goes to him gladly. So God also neatly draweth and bringeth men to himself, that they may be willingly and gladly about and with him." St. Louis, Vol. VII, 2235, 2247, 2287. By the friendly allurement of the gospel, hearty confidence is awakened in the heart, so that one confidently draws near to Christ. The Apology remarks on Matth. 11, 28: "Christ says, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you.' That is two pieces. The burden or burden, as Christ speaks of, that is the wailing, the great fright of God's wrath in the heart. Secondly, coming to Christ; for coming is nothing else, but believing that for Christ' sake sins are forgiven us." M., S. B., p. 173. Thus the Apology calls faith also an accedere ad Deum. P. 172. The very beginning of faith is also a coming to Christ. He who is first far from Christ comes to Christ by faith. The apostle Paul reminds the Gentiles in Eph. 2:11 ff. that they who were first distant and strangers to the testaments of promise have come near through the blood of Christ, through the gospel of peace. Where the prophets prophesy the conversion of the Gentiles, they often express it in such a way that the Gentiles will come to the light of Zion, will turn to the Lord, XXXX, XXX. Cf. Isa. 60, 7 ff. The New Testament Torah, the Gospel, will go out into all lands. The consequence and effect will be that the Gentiles will make pilgrimages to Zion and enter the kingdom of God, Isa. 2. The continued daily coming, going to Christ, cf. 1 Petr. 2, 4, in contrast to the first coming, is then also called abiding with Christ. Christ speaks Joh. 15, 4: "Abide in me!" "Abide in Christ" is also as much as "believe." Luther: "See that ye abide in me only by faith, where ye will keep purity, and bring forth good fruits, and not fall away upon your own doings, through avoidance, or false confidence, nor otherwise by other temptations turn away and tear you from the faith, lest ye lose both your purity, which ye have in me, and spoil the fruits, and bring them to nought." St. L. VIII, 506. By believing, persevering in faith, we abide with Christ, so we retain the purity which we have in Christ, the forgiveness of sins, and the further consequence is that we bring forth good fruits. Out of faith, union with Christ, flow good works.

536One more word about the nature of faith.

By faith we come to Christ and cling to him. To believe is also to cling. This meaning has, as Cremer correctly points out, οί *πιστεύοντες είς εμέ,* "those who believe in me," e.g. Matth. 18, 6; Mark 9, 42. In such idioms as οί *πεπιστευκότες αύτω = μαθηταί μου,* Joh. 8, 31; πάντες *πιστεύσουσιν εις αυτόν*, Joh. 11, 48; *ΐνα ίδωμεν καί πιστεύσωμέν σοι,* Joh. 6, 30, and in similar passages, as Cremer remarks, πιστεύειν, *πιοτεϋσαι* is as much as to become JEsu's disciple, follower. To cleave to Christ is the same as to cleave to his word. Luther writes St. L., 516: "I know indeed whether I believe in Christ, that is, cling to his word so preached to me. . . . Wherefore then I abide in Christ." To believe in Christ, to cleave unto his word, to abide in Christ, are one and the same thing. The saying John 6:29, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent," Luther explains, "We must cleave our hearts unto him." St. L., 2214.

Returning from the principal term of faith, πίστις, *πιστεύω,* which underlies the expressions discussed, from the term "confidence," "trust," fiducia, let us keep present that it is no cogitatio otiosa, not a mere feeling and sensation, but an inward movement of the soul, an activity of the will, when we place our trust, our confidence, in God's grace and mercy, in Christ's merit, in the promise of the gospel. This is right faith, that, to speak with our confession, we conclude in our hearts that God is gracious to us, M., S. B., P. 116, that we venture on the gracious promise of God, P. 97, that we hold fast to the promise of God, P. 101, that we cleave to Christ the Mediator, P. 99, that we make use of Christ the Mediator, Christo mediatore utimur, P. 89. 95. 97. 99. Where Luther, in his house postilion, St. L., 228, puts forward the aged Simeon, who takes the infant JEsus in his arms, as a model of faith, he writes: "It is because of this that we open our eyes and look at the little child, take him in our arms, heart him, kiss him, that we set our joy, trust, and heart on him." The most adequate Hebrew expression for πιστεύειν, "to trust," is "to lean upon," "to rely firmly upon." Of Abraham it is Gen. 15: XXXXX XXXXX - "and this he counted to him for righteousness." A cognate term is οίκοδομεΐσ& *αι,* Eph. 2, 22; 1 Pet. 2, 5: to build up, to found oneself upon. This is right faith, that we lean, brace, stiffen, ground and build ourselves upon Christum, upon fine word. "The ground whereon I am founded is Christ and His blood." Yes, faith is a very energetic act of the will. The πίστις is, as Cremer expresses himself in the above-attached quotation, "a confidence cherished with conviction, which offers defiance to opposing contradictions." Paul shows Rom. 4, 18 ff. by the example of Abraham the most peculiar kind of

and nature, the essence of justifying, saving faith. Abraham turned his eyes away from his own dead body and the deadness of Sarah's womb, he did not doubt, he overcame the doubts of his own and his wife's unfaithfulness, and turned his eyes straight and steadfastly to the promise of God. We are to learn from Abraham's example what justifying, saving faith is actually like. This is the way of faith, to believe with hope in hope. Rom 4:18 Right faith looks away from what is in front of its eyes, from its own person, from its own worth and unworthiness, from its own works, from its own sinfulness and corruption, and sees only from God's promise. Right faith does not listen to the threatening, cursing voice of the law, not to the accusations of one's own conscience, but listens to and relies solely on the promise of God, which promises us salvation, grace, forgiveness, comfort, peace in Christ. He goes, as it were, out of himself, and adheres to that which is apart from him, that which is eternally sest, the word of grace, rapit nos, as Luther says, e conspectu nostro et ponit nos extra nos, ut non nitamur viribus, conscientia, seu persona, seu operibus nostris, sed eo nitamur, quod est extra nos, hoc est, promissione et veritate Dei, quae fallere non potest. Cf. Ad Galatas, Erl. II, 161 ff. Faith sets the promise of grace against the wrath of God. The Apology writes: Promissionem opponimus irae Dei. Müller, p. 102. Luther remarks on Gen. 15, 6: "Learn that thou ascribeest righteousness . . . to the promise of Christ alone, which faith accepts, and that it may protect and defend itself from God's judgment Against its conscience." St. L. I, 948. and on Gen, 22, 11: Fides conciliat contraria nec est otiosa qualitas, sed virtus ejus est mortem occidere, infernum damnare, esse peccato peccatum, diabolo diabolum, adeo ut mors non sit mors, etiamsi omnium sensus testetur adesse mortem. When sin, death, hell terrify us, we take refuge in Christ, who by his death overcame sin, death, hell. To believe is also to take refuge, XXX. Cf. Ps. 2:12, "So, O Lord Christ, my' refuge is the cave of thy wounds." All this is true, of course, of faith in its first beginnings. *Πιστενσαι*, to become a believer, is precisely to "take confidence." The Gentile jailer at Philippi, who was frightened to death, and quite despairing, was about to throw himself on his sword, was exhorted by Paul to believe on the Lord Christ, to trust in Him, and so he would be saved, Act. 16:31, which he did, and was saved. In all this, however, we must not forget that this faith, this unconditional trust in Christ, in the grace of God, which defies the terrors of conscience, stands alone in the crown of God.

By rightly recognizing Christ, agreeing to the gospel of Christ, and by drawing from Christ and his merit our confidence, our

538One more word about the nature of "faith".

In faith we place, grasp, and take hold of Christ; as already noted above, we acquire salvation in Christ. Faith is apprehension of Christ. This is a scriptural designation of faith. But we must now also take this term fully seriously. To take hold of Christ is not an endurance and suffering, but an activity of our will. To receive Christ, his word, his grace, is to take hold of Christ, that is, to accept, receive, grasp, hold fast, and make Christ, the promise of grace, our own. The corresponding scriptural expressions are λαμβάνει and δέχεσδαι. *Λαμβάνει* means not only to get, to receive, but also actively to take, to receive, to seize, and is used of faith, of becoming a believer, precisely in this sense. The *όσοι δε ελαβο* αυτόν*, John 1:12, Luther has correctly rendered, "but as many as received him"-to whom he gave power to become God's children. The saying, "Out of his fulness have we all taken, ελάβομε, grace for grace," Joh. 1, 16, Luther rightly explains by comparing Christum to a fountain of salvation, from which we continually "draw," salvation, grace. St. L. VII, 1685. The verbum δέχεο& *αι* translates Grimm, just in the compound τον *λόγον δέχεο& αι:* pronis auribus excipio, amplector, meum facio, approbo, non respuo. To the Thessalonians the apostle Paul reminds them that they received, acknowledged as God's word, the word which they had received from him, *ίδέξασ& ε*. 1 Thess. 2, 13. The Bereans have the testimony in the Acts of the Apostles: εδέξαντο *τό λόγο μετά πόσης προ& νμίας*.. Act. 17, 11. This is equivalent to επίατενσαν', v. 12. That is, to believe, to become believers: to receive the word of Christ with all joyfulness, with eagerness and desire, with inclined mind. In the Apology it is said: Fides est medium, quo bona illa apprehendimus, accipimus nobisque applicamus. M., p. 612. fides amplectitur embraces, seizes, beneficia. P. 615. Λαμβάνει as δέχεσ& *αι* originally means manu sumere, apprehendere, to seize something with the hand, to grasp, to bring to oneself; and this is then transferred to the spiritual sphere. Thus from Scripture itself the image of the hand is suggested to us by these expressions. From of old faith, faith itself, has been called and described in the church as the taking hand, as the correlative of the divine giving and offering. Luther: "True faith, with outstretched arms, cheerfully grasps the Son of God who is given for it, and says, My beloved is mine, and I his." Cf. "Lehre und Wehre," 1906, p. 102. Hollaz, p. 1175: "To the hand of grace, which offers the treasure of righteousness and salvation, let the hand of faith correspond, which takes and grasps the treasure offered."-apprehendit et recipit. Hebenstrcit, System. II, 478: "The grasping, apprehensio, which is attributed to faith, is that act according to which someone brings and draws something to himself, ad se transfert ac trahit, and, lest it fall away or be snatched from him

"He holds it, as it were, closed in his hand". That is to say, without illustration, that a man inwardly grasps, with heart and will, with desire, the righteousness and blessedness presented in the Word, Christ, his Redeemer, who died for him, brings and draws Him to himself, saying, This is my Saviour, and holds fast his Saviour. This, indeed, is not the fruit and consequence, but the very essence of justifying and saving faith. With such a description of faith as the taking hand, it is only made quite clear and vivid what apprehensio Christi is, what it means to take Christ or the Word, to seize, λαμβάνειν, *δέχεσθαι*. Christ saith Matt. 11:12, "From the days of John until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and they that need violence seize it."- *ἡ βασιλεία των ουρανών βιάζεται, και βιασταί ἁρπάζουσιν αυτήν*. Similarly Luk. 16, 16: *από τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεού ευαγγελίζεται και πας εις αυτήν βιάζεται* - "from that time the kingdom of God is preached, and everyone who needs violence enters," everyone who needs violence enters. The opinion is: the kingdom of God has come in and with Christ, the kingdom of God with its treasures of grace is now proclaimed, offered through the gospel. The thing to do now is to enter into this kingdom, to take possession of it, or in other words, to believe in the gospel. But this entering is a forcible penetration, this appropriation a forcible snatching. Faith needs violence, in so far as it tears itself away from its own nature, from its own works, in so far as it offers defiance to the terrors of conscience, opposes the wrath of God to the Mediator, Christ. It is just the coming to faith, the beginning of faith, that is described here. It is a question of how one who is far from the kingdom of God, who does not have it, comes into the kingdom of God, becomes partaker of it. Admittedly, the βιάζεσθαι then passes through the whole life of faith. Calov remarks on Matth. 11, 12, that here the kingdom of grace is spoken of, into which we seek to enter by faith, ad quod fide aspiramus, non operibus, and then shows how far this is done by force, why the kingdom of grace must be seized by force. Chemnitz writes in the Gospel Harmony, p. 559 sf.: Fidem vero, qua cor ardenti desiderio et fiducia quaerit, apprehendit et sibi applicat promissionem gratiae in verbo evangelii propositam, Christus peculiari phrasi describit apud Matthaeum (11, 12), quae sententia etiam Luc. 16, 16 repetitur: Regnum coelorum vim patitur, et violenti rapiunt illud, seu, ut Lucas inquit, quivis vim facit in illud. Sensus autem simplicissime hic est: fidem justificantem non esse historicam tantum notitiam, non Epicuream persuasionem, non otiosam et frigidam cogitationem, sed ardentem cordis affectum,' quod desiderat, quaerit, apprehendit et retinet regnum coelorum, quod in evangelio proponitur et offertur. Utitur autem his vocabulis βιάζεται et βιασταί ἁρπάζουσιν. . . . Hoc loco Christus ex professo describit, quam ardenti affectu fides esuriens et

sitiens justitiam feratur ad occupandum regnum coelorum. . . . Ex hac exemplorum collatione intelligi potest, Christum verbo βιάζεσ&. *αι* voluisse describere naturam et proprietatem fidei justificantis, quod scilicet non sit otiosa notitia nec frigida cogitatio, sed ardentissimus cordis affectus, qui ferventi desiderio, lucta et conatu per omnia obstacula, gemitu, petitione et fiducia eo feratur, ut regnum coelorum, quod verbo offertur, ita quaerat, amplectatur et retinere cogitet, sicut illi, qui violentia aliquid invadere et occupare conantar, nullis laboribus parcunt, nullis periculis absterrentur. . . . Vera igitur fides haec est, cujus objectum est regnum coelorum, et forma talis est, qualis verbo βιάζεσ& *αι* describitur. This means in literal translation: "Den
But faith, when the heart seeks, seizes and appropriates the promise of grace presented in the word of the gospel with burning desire and trust, is described by Christ in a peculiar way in Matthew (11, 12), as this sentence is also repeated in Luke 16, 16: the kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and those who need violence seize it, or as Luke says: everyone enters it by force. But the meaning is simply this. Justifying faith is not merely historical knowledge, not an epicurean conviction, not an idle, cold thought, but an ardent affection of the heart, which desires, seeks, grasps, and holds fast the kingdom of heaven held out and presented in the gospel. But he uses these expressions, βιάζεται et βιαοτα′ι *άρπά ζονοιν*. ... In this place Christ expressly describes with what burning affect faith, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, rushes to take possession of the kingdom of heaven. . . . By comparing these examples it may be seen that Christ intended by the word βιάζεσῦαι to describe the nature and peculiarity of rightly finishing faith, that the same is not an idle knowledge nor a cold thought, but the most ardent affect of the heart, which there with ardent desire , ...with struggle and effort through all obstacles, with sighing, supplications, and confidence, that it may so seek, seize, and intend to hold fast the kingdom of heaven which is offered in the word, as those who force their way into something, try to take possession of it, spare no pains, are not deterred by any dangers. . . . This, then, is right faith, whose object is the kingdom of heaven, whose essence is such as is described by the word βιάζεαϋαι." Yes certainly, by the expression βιάζεοϋαι, chosen by Christo himself', as Chemnitz here explains it in more detail, justifying faith, according to its beginning and progress (apprehendere et retinere), the nature and peculiarity of faith, the essence of faith is described ex professo. Note still Luther's marginal gloss on Matth. 11:12: "Consciences, when they hear the gospel, urge them on, so that no one can resist them." In his Annotationes in aliquot

capita Matthaei, St. L. VII, 123. 124, Luther emphasizes that Christ Matth. 11, 12. 13 boasts of the fruit of the word, and names as the fruit of the word, of the ministry of preaching, such people as do violence to the kingdom of heaven, snatch it to themselves, who desire to be blessed, who are driven by their conscience, that they anxiously seek forgiveness of sins, or in a word: the faithful. Here again βιάζεσθαι is to him as much as believe, and he emphasizes that the βιάζεσθαι, the Faith, is wrought by the Word.

Quenstedt IV, 284 defines fiducia, this principal moment of justifying, beatific faith, as follows: Haec apprehensio est voluntatis et practica, quae totius cordis et voluntatis in merito Christi recumbentiam involvit notatque desiderium et accessum ad Christum ejusque meriti applicationem fiducialem, et haec proprie est fiducia. Or more briefly: Fiducia est credendo in Christum ire, credendo ei adhaerere. Similar definitions are found in other Lutheran dogmatists. If such terms as desiderium, "longing, desire for Christ," accessus ad Christum, "to approach Christ," in Christum ire, "to enter into Christ," Christo adhaerere, "to cling to Christ," and the like are excluded from the concept and essence of fiducia, nothing remains of fiducia, fiducia becomes a meaningless phrase.

We speak of the justifying, saving faith, as the Scriptures speak of it, as the church of righteousness has always spoken of it. Faith is by its very nature trust, a certain confidence. Or, unfolding this term: Faith is a confident waiting, a longing, a reasonable seeking, a longing, a desire, a confident going, coming, approaching, a clinging, a firm supporting, building, founding, a certain hope, a hope against hope, overcoming doubt, fear, dread, a joyful grasping, seizing, taking, accepting, receiving, drawing, tearing, The object is always the salvation of God in Christ presented in the gospel. The motus animi, motus cordis, and voluntatis, which are called by these expressions, are nothing else than the subjective appropriation of salvation. And this is precisely faith. If that which belongs to the appropriation of salvation is put forward as the consequence, fruit, effect of faith, that is, as the work of the law, as the fulfilment of obedience to the first tablet of the law, this is a wicked mixture of law and gospel. The correlative of the promise of the gospel is faith. And he then who in faith has appropriated to himself the salvation promised in the gospel, has accepted God's gift, gives then also-this is the fruit and consequence of faith-to God what is due to God, the owing obedience according to the holy ten commandments, love to God and to man. G. St.

# The "other spirit" of the Reformed Church.

(Continued.)

The Lutheran Church teaches, on the basis of Scripture, not only that we are saved by grace alone, not only that this grace is acquired for us through Christ, not only that we can acquire this grace through faith alone, but also this: that God has ordained certain means in which he has placed this grace and through which he gives it to us. These means are the so-called means of grace, word and sacrament. In these means is the grace which God from eternity bears in his heart towards us poor sinners, which Christ has purchased for us; they are the hands with which God presents grace to us, that he may be all in all, and be nothing of which we can boast. To this belongs also absolution, which is, after all, nothing else than a summary of the Gospel. Hence our church confesses in the Schmalkaldic Articles: "In this matter, so far as the outward word is concerned, it is to be firmly adhered to, that God gives no man his Spirit or grace without through and with the preceding outward word. . . . Therefore we ought and must insist that God will not deal with us men except by his outward word and sacrament. But all that is vaunted by the Spirit without such word and sacrament is the devil." Likewise it is said in the Apology, "Now God cannot be dealt with, so God cannot be known, sought, nor apprehended, but in the word and by the word alone, as Paul saith: 'The gospel is a power of God to all who believe it,'" and in the Formula of Concord: "Such righteousness is presented (**offertur**) to us by the Holy Spirit through the gospel and in the sacraments, and applied, appropriated, and accepted through faith." To the Lutheran Church, then, Word and Sacrament are real means of grace, means in which and through which God presents, powerfully offers, and bestows His grace upon us. Word and sacrament are for her God's hands filled with grace, which he stretches out to man from heaven, the channels through which the fresh water of God's grace pours into the mouth of faith. The outward word, according to Lutheran doctrine, is not an empty, powerless announcement that God intends to do something for man under certain circumstances and conditions, but the certain promise that he has already done everything, everything that is necessary for my blessedness. The word is, as it were, the bill of sale with the seal of the sacraments, by which heaven is ascribed to me as my own. And at the same time God works faith in me through the outward preaching, so that I now also accept what has long belonged to me, and rejoice and take comfort in it. Likewise the sacraments are according to our doctrine, which is founded on God's clear word,

This is an effective means of grace, "wherein by certain outward means heavenly things are dispensed, whereby God appoints, appropriates, and seals the promise of grace of the gospel to men." Baptism is the bath of regeneration, that is, a bath by which regeneration is wrought. It works forgiveness of sins, it delivers from death and the devil, it gives "eternal blessedness. And the holy supper is the true body and blood of Christ; in, with, and under the blessed bread and wine, we really and truly receive the true body and blood of the Lord, .the ransom which he paid for our sins at Calvary.

From this Lutheran biblical doctrine of the means of grace the Reformed doctrine is principally different, that is, the false doctrine of the Reformed Church is conditional in its basic direction. The well-known Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper - to cite a specific example - is not just another difference between the Reformed and Lutheran churches among other differences, but only one point of doctrine among many others in which the false basic direction of the Reformed church comes to light. Even if it wanted to, the Reformed Church could not really give up its doctrine of the Lord's Supper and accept the Lutheran doctrine without at the same time changing its entire basic direction, or rather rejecting its entire dualistic system of doctrine. Luther recognized this, and therefore at the colloquy at Marburg he hurled at the Reformed the words, "Ye have another spirit!" This is also admitted on the part of the Reformers. Hagenbach writes: "To be sure, the dispute hung visibly on the little word 'is' or 'means'. But this is only the outer handle by which we can touch the two different theological ways of thinking of the contending parties, the outermost point wherein they run out." (Kirchengesch. 3, 282.) To the Reformed Church it is now considered a settled truth that the divine and the human, the heavenly and the earthly, can now and never be united. Consequently there is no real union of the two natures into one person in Christ; consequently the written and preached word is without spirit and life; consequently absolution is a papist man's fancy, and baptism and the Lord's Supper are only symbolic acts and emblems of an absent grace.

Let us now let Reformed theologians and confessional writings have their say on this point as well.

Zwingli writes, "The word that is heard is by no means the word by which we believe; for if the word heard or the word read could make believers, we would all be believers. The word of faith adheres in the minds of believers; it itself is judged by no one, but by it the external word is judged." What all Zwingli wants understood when he speaks of the

Hagenbach may tell us that Zwingli speaks of the "Word" or of the "Gospel"; he writes: "Zwingli grasped the Gospel magnificently according to the spirit, not according to the letter. - Not only what Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John have written, but everything that has ever been made known to man by God, which has assured them of the will of God. - In his concept of the Word of God, he does not immediately proceed from the written Word as the first, but to him the Word is the living creative Word of God, by which all things were made. But now he goes on to show by the sacred history of the Bible how just then God's Word (revelation) reached men. The sum of all revelation is Christ to him. How splendidly Zwingli knows how to put his world-historical meaning into the light! Who," he asks, "has ever become greater in the world than Christ? Alexander and Caesar were great, and yet they had hardly half the world under them. But to Christ they have come from the going forth and coming down of the sun, who have believed in him. Yea, the whole wide world hath believed on him, and known him to be the Son of the Highest, and hath praised him, and his kingdom is without end.'" By the Word, then, Zwingli basically understands something that is in God and that He reveals in various ways. The written Word is to him only one mode of revealing the Word, and a very uncertain one at that. Much more certain is the Word which is immediately in the heart of man; for, "What the inner voice speaks, the hoping soul does not deceive." (Schiller.) - Second Helvetic Confession: "Nor do we believe that outward preaching appears to be useless, because the teaching of true religion depends on the inward illumination of the mind. . . . For although no one comes to Christ unless he is drawn from the heavenly Father and inwardly enlightened, yet we know that God wants his word preached outwardly as well. . . . This preaching is called by the apostle the Spirit, and the ministry of the Spirit, because it is made effectual and living by faith in the ears, and even in the hearts, of them that believe by the enlightening Spirit. . . . Let us believe that God in his word teaches us outwardly through ministers, but inwardly moves the hearts of his elect to faith through the Holy Spirit. . . . We see that among all nations the outward preaching of the apostles and evangelists or bishops preceded faith, which we owe to the Holy Spirit alone." (Guenther, Symb., p. 191.) - Ecolampad: "The words of Scripture have not the force and power to teach what they imply, unless we wished to make a **magiam of** them; the human heart has inwardly the force of words. . .. To the outward words, as elements, is no more conferred, than to signify the inward words which are beforehand in the hearts of men."

In view of the Reformed Church's position on the Word of Scripture, which, according to Paul's testimony, is "the power of God which saves all who believe in it," it is only to be expected that it would completely reject absolution on the part of a preacher. That a preacher for his own person has not the power to forgive sin is evident. And since, according to the Reformed view, even the word which a preacher of the gospel utters is an empty shell, a word "which has neither the power nor the power to teach what it means," it must seem, from the Reformed point of view, a ridiculous, even blasphemous farce, when a Lutheran preacher says to his confessors, "From such your confession I forgive you . . instead of and by the blessing of my Lord JEsu Christ all your sins," etc. "Frivolous it seems," writes Zwingli, "therefore all this: I absolve you, and: I make thee sure that thy sins are forgiven thee. God alone remits sin through Jesus Christ, His Son. Whosoever shall confess these things unto the creature, depriveth God of his glory, and giveth it to him that is not God. This therefore is true idolatry." In quite the same sense the Reformed confessional writings speak out, even the "Book of Common Prayer," which is nevertheless regarded by some as almost a Lutheran book.1) Spurgeon, who is in many respects so excellent, speaks about absolution in quite the same sense as Zwingli. In his sermon on Luk 18, 13 he writes: "Absolution from the lips of man, I do believe, is little short of blasphemy. There is in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England an absolution which I should think must be almost a verbatim extract from the Romish missal. I do not hesitate to say that there was never anything more blasphemous printed in Holywell Street than the absolution that is to be pronounced by a clergyman over a dying man; and it is positively frightful to think that any persons calling themselves Christians should rest easy in a church until they have done their utmost to get that most excellent book thoroughly' reformed and revised, and to get the popery purged out of it." In another place the same writes: "Sirs, let us say the truth; however much yonder priest may pretend at his parishioner's bedside to forgive sin, the man's sins are not forgiven; and the troubled conscience of the sinner often bears witness to the fact, as the Day of Judgment and the fearful hell of sinners must also bear witness. And what think you, sirs, must be the curse that fills the mouth of the damned souls,

1) The formulas of absolution in the Book of Common Prayer are worded in such a way that no actual forgiveness of sins is pronounced, but only the indication is given that God and whom God forgives, or the wish is expressed that he will forgive. In addition to this, the Episcopalians base the efficacy of absolution not on the power of the Word, but on the power of their office, on apostolic succession.

when in another world they meet the priest who absolved them with this sham absolution? With what reproaches will such deceived ones meet the priest who sent them down to perditiori with a lie in their right hands!"

As far as the Reformed doctrine of baptism and the Lord's Supper is concerned, it is so well known that it is not necessary to explain it or to confirm it as a Reformed doctrine by means of Reformed testimonies. Only one passage from Zwingli's Creed may be mentioned, since it so clearly expresses the Reformed way of looking at things. Zwingli writes: "I believe, indeed I know, that all sacraments, far from conferring grace, do not even bring it or administer it. For as grace comes from the divine Spirit and is given, so that gift comes to the Spirit alone. But to the Spirit no guide or vehicle is necessary, for he himself is the power and the bearer, by whom all things are borne, who has no need to be borne. Nor have we ever read in Scripture that sensual things, such as the sacraments are, bring the Spirit with them, but if sensual things were brought with the Spirit, it was the Spirit that brought, not sensual things. . . . It is not, therefore, by this immersion, not by this drink, not by this unction, that the grace of the Spirit is brought; for if this were so, it would be known already how, where, wherein, and whither the Spirit would be brought; for if the presence and efficacy of grace be attached to the sacraments, they work where they are brought; where they are not applied, all wither. From this this is concluded (which I readily and willingly admit in the point of the sacraments), that the sacraments are given for a public testimony of that grace which every individual hath before. The Church, therefore, by the Tause, publicly excepts him who is before excepted by grace. Therefore the vault does not bring grace, but testifies to the church that grace has become to him to whom it is given. I believe, therefore, that the sacrament is the sign of a holy thing, that is, of grace come to pass." 2) And thus

2) An example of Zwingli's mindless mockery of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. In a sermon he said: "If Christ says that they also are with him in his glory, which the Father has given him, then they must all also be with him in the bread, and so the long Christoffel must also adorn himself close together in such small bread." This is what Hagenbach calls a mighty sermon. - A polemic against Luther, titled: "Clear Instruction of the Supper of Christ for the Sake of the Simple, so that they may not be deceived with anyone's sophistry," concludes with the following profound poetic effusion: "Tell me whether you know that Father, Sun, and Spirit, flesh and blood, bread and wine, may all be one God?" (Hagenb. 3, 292 ff.)

As it can be seen that the Reformed Church has remained true to itself in its wrong basic direction even in its noblest men up to the present day, one more statement by Spurgeon about baptism should be mentioned. He says: "Baptism is an admirable ordinance of God in which the believer holds fellowship with Christ in his death. It is a symbol; it is nothing more. Tens of thousands and millions have been baptized and have died in their sins." Not only the saying itself, but the reason Spurgeon gives against the power of baptism is characteristic. Because thousands have been baptized and yet have died in their sins, therefore baptism is said to have no power to work forgiveness of sins. This is the very same reason which Zwingli asserts against the power of the word, when he says, "If the word read or the word heard could make believers, we would all be believers." Because this, Zwingli means to say, is not the case, it follows that the word has no power to make a man a believer. If this argument holds, then the conclusion also holds: if we were all really and truly saved, we should also all be saved; but since not all men are saved, it follows that they are not all saved. And this is what the matter amounts to even with a Spurgeon. "They believe," says he, "that Judas was atoned for just as much as Peter; they believe that the damned in hell were as much an object of Jesus Christ's satisfaction as the saved in heaven; and though they do not say it in proper words, yet they must mean it, for it is a fair inference, that in the case of multitudes Christ died in vain, for He died for them all, they say; and yet so ineffectual was His dying for them that, though He died for them, they are damned after- ivard. *Now* such an atonement I despise ... I reject it."

In accordance with this position on the sacraments, the vast majority of Reformed sects reject infant baptism, and all agree that baptism administered by a layman, or even by a woman, is invalid. Calvin writes: "Of baptism performed by women, we judge that it is a hair-raising impertinence that a female person should interfere here against the law of nature, and doubt not for a moment that such an outrage is certainly not to be acknowledged. . . . To permit midwives (namely, in case of need) to baptize is an ungodly and shameful desecration." To the Reformed, baptism is a mere ceremony of admission into the usufructuary community of Christians, and such, of course, can only be legitimately performed by one commissioned by the Church to do so.

In this lesson, too, the characteristic features of the Reformed school of thought are clearly evident. Let us unite them into a complete picture! - It is a propensity, a wild passion of natural reason, to speculate in divine things. An unbroken ass's fill, as it were, nothing is so to her

It is more troublesome than to walk by the bridle of God's word. It disdains to accept with gratitude what God has revealed in his word about his nature and will; it disdains to accept strange children; it wants to fertilize itself by speculation and thus give birth to itself. It boldly asserts that in it all thoughts lie decided and can be produced by reflection. To let God tell us what he is like, and how we can be reconciled and united with him, seems to her to be too pupil-like. When God has condescended, when he has revealed himself in his word, then speculation is over, and there is no longer any need for ascents on the wings of the spirit. There remains nothing but a believing apprehension of God wrapped up in the Word and in the sacraments. Under such circumstances we must not strive above the clouds to get the little worm of the forgiveness of sins, but God has already come down to us in His Word, and holds out to us, as a bird to its helpless young, this little worm, saying, "Open thy mouth wide, let me fill it!" Ps. 81, 11. Therefore the Reformed spirit empties the Word and the holy sacraments of their contents. The written word is nothing to him but an outward instruction and directive, by which nothing can be effected at bottom, any more than the best instruction in painting is of any use to one in whom there is no genius for painting. Even the benefit which a genius painter derives from the best instruction is, strictly speaking, not to be ascribed to the instruction, but to his ability to process mentally the instruction he has received, to convert the words into colors and pictures. So also, according to the Reformed view, no one ever came to faith by the outward word. Rom. 10:17 should really read, "So then faith cometh not from preaching." According to Reformed doctrine, there is in man, or rather in the elect, a spiritual ability to become partakers of the Spirit of God without and apart from the written word. It is not the Word that makes alive by giving faith, but the reverse: faith makes alive the Word. Not the word communicates spirit and life, but vice versa: the word receives spirit and life through the inner light in the heart.

This inner light, however, is said to have been directly kindled by the Holy Spirit, for the Reformed refer to this passage: "The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going. So is every one that is born of the Spirit," John 3:8. Therefore, to the Reformed, word and sacrament are actually superfluous; he uses both only as holy ordinances of God. The sacraments, especially, are to him only outward signs of the grace immediately given; they are to him only occasions for making ascents, as Calvin says: "In the Lord's Supper no gifts come down from heaven, much-

more does the believing soul ascend to the exalted Savior," which oft-repeated pronouncement gave rise three hundred years ago to the saying, "The Swiss have transferred their supper from the church to heaven."

Accordingly, the Reformed concept of faith is essentially different from the Lutheran concept, even though the Reformed do not oppose the Lutheran definition of faith with an antithesis. For us Lutherans, the formality of faith is a certain confidence in the promise of God given in Scripture. Faith and promise are correlatives to us. To the Reformed, however, faith is not such an unconditional reliance on the Word. Word and sacrament are to him empty, powerless elements which do not "bring forth what they imply". In Scripture there is for him no "finished truth," in the sacraments no heavenly good which he could appropriate by faith. Consistently Reformed thought, faith is rather an immediate, intuitively acquired knowledge that I am with God in grace, an immediate feeling and sensing of God in the heart. "This effect" (namely, of regeneration), says the Dordrecht Resolutions, p. 49, "believers cannot fully comprehend in this life, meanwhile reassure themselves by knowing and feeling, by that grace of God, that they heartily believe and love their Saviour." Spurgeon asks the question, "Can a man know that his sins are forgiven?" and gives the answer, "Certainly he can. The pardon which is sealed in heaven is resealed in our conscience. The mercy which is recorded above is made to shed its light into the darkness of our hearts." (Vol. 6, 160.) Yes, faith in the Reformed takes the place, as it were, of the missing means of grace, in that it (faith) does not drink from the stream of grace which flows down to it from heaven in Word and Sacrament, but is itself the "channel," the "tube," wherein the water of life trickles, the "wire" which conveys to us the living spark of God's grace, of which parables Spurgeon is fond of making use. (Vol. 16, 198.) (Zwingli occasionally defines faith as "good, faithful disposition." Hagenbach 3, 461.)

From whichever side we look at the Reformed doctrine, we are always confronted with a wisdom that comes not from above but from below; in all the doctrines of the Reformed Church, the changing oracles of human reason take the place of the certain Word of God, which is written in scriptures. And how gloriously far the oracular Reformed mind has come in the course of time, we have plenty to see. Methodism with its raptures, Spiritism with its sinister knockings, the Quakers with their absolute rejection of the written word, the Faith Cure and Christian Science gushers with their nonsensical assertions, the laterna magica which is supposed to take the place of preaching,

The Christian Endeavor and Epworth Leagues, and other similar associations, to help the dead church to its feet, the Sunday-school rallies with their banners of honor and their idolatry of flags, in short, the mass of fancy, the vast jumble of "means of grace," which is annually brought into the market, is a quite consistent further development of Reformed doctrine. If God has not Himself ordained for us certain means of grace, has not Himself told us where He is to be found, and what is the way by which we may come to Him, well, let every one make up means of grace to suit his own taste, and follow his inner light whithersoever he will. If we have no certain means of grace in the Word and the sacraments, if we are rather directed to the wind that blows where and where it wills, well, then, let each one stretch out his coattails and sail at random!

O of the poor souls that languish at these pitted fountains of reformed doctrine! For truly this is a desolate doctrine. There is nothing there that can give a steady hold to a fearful and bruised heart. Everything is made of bolts and built of clouds. There is nowhere for the soul to find a sure rod and staff for its wanderings through the dark valley of death.

And what a desolate office, according to this doctrine, is the holy office of preaching! In what does it consist? What are the goods that are familiar to a preacher of the gospel, according to this doctrine, that he may give the household their due? Empty words, water, bread, and wine. These are the mysteries over which God has set his preachers to be stewards, these are the goods of grace which are familiar to them according to Reformed doctrine. Truly, if the matter were really so, there would be no more miserable work than the work of an evangelical preacher, and we should think it an irony when the apostle speaks of the preaching office as of a "delicious work." Therefore, God in grace preserve our Evangelical Lutheran Church from every droplet of the "other spirit"! H. Spd.

(Conclusion follows.)

## On the history of infant baptism.

(Continued instead of ending.)

Now did the apostles water, sprinkle, or immerse? To answer this question, it is first necessary to know what the meaning of the word is. If we want to know what it means in the Scriptures, we must look at how it is used in the Scriptures and not in the so-called classical Greek.

The verb **βαπτίζειν** and the derived nouns: **βαπ- *τισμός, βάπτισμα, βαπτιστής,*** are used 122 times in the New Testament.

needs, but not even in the sense in which secular writers use them. In any case these words: **βαπ *τίζειν, βαπτισμός, βάπτισμα,*** denote a religious act. ***Βαπτιστής*** is never

the proprietor of a bath-house, or a **laundryman**, or a dyer, but each time "the Baptist." Next, the words βάπτισμα**,** βαπτισμός, and **βαπτιστής do** not occur at all in the profanity. "**It is, therefore, an exegetical outrage to force upon these words a meaning constructed from their remote etymology, as from the root βαφ, or taken from the classical secular authors. It is a violation of a general rule of interpretation to translate βαπτίζειν by immerse, a meaning which that verb never has in New Testament Greek, or βάπτισμα and βαπτισμός by immersion, a sense which those nouns never have anywhere.**" ***(Theol. Quarterly* V, p. 7.)**

*"**Βαπτίζειν*** denotes in the New Testament, with the exception of Mark. 7, 4, throughout, the religious act of water baptism, the baptism of John, and then Christian baptism. Likewise the noun βάπ- ***τισμα***. And since, therefore, the original meaning 'to immerse' has quite receded, so also such compounds as.

Matth. 28, 19; Apost. 8, 16; 19, 5; 1 Cor. 1, 13. 15; **εἰς *τόν Μωνσήν,*** 1 Cor. 10, 2; εἰς ***Χριστόν, εἰς τόν θάνατον αυτόν, is*** not based on the idea as if the person baptized were immersed in Moses, in Christ, in Christ's name, in Christ's death, but this points to the relation in which he who is baptized is placed to the person or thing in question. We are baptized of Christ JEsum, which means nothing else than that through baptism we have been set in relation to Christ JEsu, in connection and fellowship with him." (Stöckhardt, Epistle to the Romans, p. 284.)

We see the scriptural meaning of this word also from the fact that the religious purifications of the Jews are called "many a baptism," **διάφοροι *βαπτισμοί,*** Heb. 9, 10. The writer of this epistle does not say ***ἐν πολλοῖς* or *ἐν πλείοσι βαπτισμοῖς.*** They were not merely many baptisms, but baptisms of various kinds, baptisms performed in different ways and on different objects. Also **διάφορος** argues that **βαπτίζειν** had not merely the one meaning "to immerse," but denoted various modes of purification by water. The same results when we consider the various baptisms of the Jews.

"This is the law when a man dies in the tabernacle: He that entereth into the tabernacle, and all that is in the tabernacle, shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel that hath neither cover nor cord shall be unclean. And whosoever toucheth any man slain with the sword, or any dead body, or any man's bone, or any grave, out of the field, shall be unclean seven days. So they shall take for the unclean one who is unclean.

Put the ashes of this burnt sin offering and running water on them in a vessel. And a clean man shall take the aspen, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tabernacle, and upon all the vessels, and upon all the souls that are therein; even upon him that hath touched the bones of the dead, or the slain, or the dead, or the grave. And the clean person shall sprinkle the unclean person on the third day and on the seventh day, and on the seventh day he shall cleanse him; and he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and he shall be clean at even," Num. 19:14-19. The main thing, the most important thing in this cleansing, was the sprinkling water, as is evident from the following two verses. Thus, as here described, the children of Israel also defiled themselves after the battle with Midian, Num. 31:19-24. It was not the washing of the garments or the bathing of the body that made clean, but the sprinkling water. Compare v. 12: "He shall purify himself with this on the third day and on the seventh day, and he shall be clean", with v. 20 and 21.

Of the cleansing of the Levites we read 4 Mos. 8, 7: "Thus shalt thou do unto them, that thou mayest cleanse them: thou shalt sprinkle water of sin upon them, and they shall all shave off their hair clean, and wash their clothes, and they shall be clean." He also that was healed of leprosy was cleansed by sprinkling, washing of clothes, shearing of hair, and by bathing with water, Deut. 14:2-9. If the supposed leprosy was gout, the person had to wash his clothes, and he was clean, Deut. 13:6. 034 If the leprosy had departed from the garment, or from the woof, or from the concord, or from all manner of skins, it must be washed; then it was clean, Deut. 13:58. The priest and he that burned the red heifer must wash their clothes, and bathe their bodies in water. He who had gathered up the ashes of the heifer had to wash his clothes, 4 Mos. 19, 7. 8. 10. The priests had to be washed at their dedication, 2 Mos. 29, 4; 40, 12; 3 Mos. 8, 2-7. When the priests entered the sanctuary they had to wash their hands and feet, 2 Mos. 30:17-21; 40:30-32; whoever touched or carried the carrion of an unclean animal had to wash his clothes, Deut. 11:24-28; also whoever touched, carried, or ate the carrion of a clean animal had to wash his clothes, Deut. 11:39, 40. If a priest had touched anything unclean, he was to bathe his body with water, Deut. 22, 4-7. If a man had an unclean river, he was to wash his clothes and bathe himself with water, Deut. 15, 1-13. If a man's seed escaped in his sleep, he was to bathe all his flesh with water, Deut. 15, 16, likewise all that was stained with such seed, v. 17; likewise the woman with whom such had lain, v. 18. A woman that had had the flow of blood should wash her clothes, and bathe herself with water, v. 19-27. At the yearly propitiatory sacrifice, the

High priest "bathed his flesh with water" before he went into the holy of holies to the mercy seat, and again when the holy act was over, Deut. 16, 4. 24. Whoever led the goat into the wilderness and whoever led the bull and the goat of the sin offering out and burned them, had to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh with water, Deut. 16, 26-28. Whoever ate anything that died of itself or was torn by the savage was to wash his clothes and bathe himself with water, 3 Mos. 17, 15. The cleansing of unknown manslaughter was done by washing hands, 5 Mos. 21, 6. Whoever was harmed in the night was to bathe himself with water, 5 Mos. 23, 10. 11. (Cf. further 3 Mos. 6, 26-28; 15, 2. 17; 8, 21; 9, 14; 11, 32; 4 Mos. 31, 20 ff.).

These were the "various baptisms" practiced by the Jews at God's command from the time of Moses until Christ.

they are called because they were to be performed on various objects and were done in various ways, namely, by sprinkling, washing the clothes (XXX walken, washing), and bathing oneself (XXX). The LXX translates XXX as **λονεο&** ***αι.*** Both words mean "to wash, to bathe" without indicating how this washing or bathing is to be done. Nowhere are we told that this washing must be done by immersion or submersion. We are told of Naaman, however, that he immersed himself seven times in the Jordan, XXXX after Elisha had commanded him to wash, XXXX, 2 Kings 5:10, 14. Naaman would have obeyed Elisha's command if he had even washed himself. Naaman was evidently not all over afflicted with leprosy. (Cf. v. 11.) He had expected Elisha to pass over the place with his hand, and so put off the leprosy. So probably Naaman also immersed himself only so far as he was leprous. The "as the man of God had spoken" refers to "in the Jordan seven times" and not from "immerse". This addition is made because Naaman, in his anger, would not wash in Jordan, but in the waters of Amana and Pharphar at Damascus, which were better than all the waters in Israel. But by his servants he was then induced to wash in Jordan, "as the man of God had spoken." These words cannot refer to his immersion, for Elisha had not commanded that. XXX is not synonymous with XXX. Perhaps Naaman's zeal is also to be implied here. Elisha had said, "wash thyself," but had not specified how he was to wash; so he immersed himself. If the Jewish cleansings were to be by immersion or submersion, why did not the Holy Spirit use the word XXX? From the very fact that he always chooses the more general word XXX, it is evident that he meant to leave the manner blank. It is true that the Talmudists demand immersion; but in doing so they go beyond God's

Word. So they also demand bathing - immersion of the body, where God only commands to wash the clothes. From the Talmudists we can learn what was taught and practiced in later Judaism, but not what God's word is.

God says the garments are to be washed (XXX, to bring out the dirt by treading in water, where the idea of immersion in water is included). But to conclude from this, that because the garments must be immersed, therefore man must also be immersed, is again wrong. By what right may you here lift the idea of immersion out of XXX and apply it to XXX? It would be just so right to say: as the clothes are trodden and kneaded in washing, so man must also be trodden and kneaded in washing. If we must here define XXX more closely after the word XXX, we must apply the whole meaning of XXX. We must conclude thus: as the garments are washed, so also must man be washed. Such a procedure would perhaps cure many an immerser of his fixed idea. Further, I would ask, Why does not God at least once put the word XXX when he speaks of the washing of the body? He always refers to the washing of the body, of the hands, of the feet, by XXX; the washing of the garments, of the woof, of the coat, etc., by XXX. The word XXX is never used in the proper sense of washing a man, only in the figurative sense, of purifying the heart, cleansing from sins, Ps. 51:4, 9; Jer. 4:14. (Jer. 2:22 is put only a problematic case. No one is expected to attempt it). 1)

As already mentioned, the Jews themselves gradually tightened the purification laws significantly. About this we are told in Mark. 7, 3. 4: "For the Pharisees and all the Jews eat not, but wash their hands sometimes, keeping the ordinances of the elders. And when they come from the market, they eat not, they wash themselves" **(εάν μή *βαπτίσωνται.* Codex Sinaiticus: ραντίσων *ται* = to** sprinkle, to cleanse by sprinkling; then to cleanse at all, to make clean. [Is this perhaps a gloss, to imply that such purification was by sprinkling?]). "And of the thing is much that they have accepted to keep, to wash of drinking vessels, and pitchers, and vessels of brass, and tables ***(βαπτιομονς πονηριών καί ξεονών καί χαλκίων καί κλινών***)." Christ reproaches them v. 8: "Ye forsake the commandment of God, and keep the ordinances of men, to wash from pitchers and drinking vessels ***(βαπνισμονς);*** and likewise do ye much." So also their purification was by the washing of the hands - water was poured over the hands and rubbed together - and by

1) "To this it must be added, that the New Testament baptism is not really the antitype of the Levitical washings, but of the **ραννιαμός.**" (Cremer, Dictionary.)

*βαπτίζειν*, namely, by sprinkling. This is also evident from the divergent readings of X and B. All the other codices have βαπτίαωνται.

"The ραντίοωνται of X, B is an interpretative substitution for the original βαπτίαωνται of A, D, Γ, *Π,* etc." *(Luth. Comm.,* p. 124.)

The "Lutheran Commentary" remarks on v. 4: "Coming from the market-place, except they wash themselves, not by bathing (Meyer), but by an effusion or sprinkling (cf. Numb. 8, 7; 19, 13, etc.; Ezek. 36, 25; Hebr. 9, 13; 10, 22), to become clean from the defilement contracted by contact (Lev. 15, 11) in the market-place. In like manner there are many other laws about washings of wooden" (Dnmerfung: "None of the vessels could be earthen, as these, when defiled, were to be broken, Lev. 15, 12.") "cups and pots, which latter, containing about a pint, were the Roman sextarii, sixths, being the sixth part of a congius; and brazen vessels, literally, coppers, large copper caldrons, and reclining couches, which had been defiled by ceremonially unclean persons." (Note: "'Couches,' though wanting in X, B, L, d, is to be retained, for its omission is more probable than its addition.") "These couches, as well as the 'coppers/ show that βαπτιαμούς cannot mean immersions."

Vincent, too, in his "Word Studies in the New Testament," admits at bem words κλινών*;* "If this belongs in the text, we certainly cannot explain βαπτιομονς as immersion."

About the meaning of the word Vincent says: "The New Testament use of the word to denote submersion for a religious purpose may be traced back to the Levitical washings. See Levit. 9, 32 (of vessels); 11, 40 (of clothes); Numb. 8, 6. 7 (sprinkling with purifying water); Exod. 30, 19. 21 (washing hands and feet). The word appears to have been at that time the technical term for such washings (compare Luke 11, 38; Hebr. 9, 10; Mark 7, 4) and could not therefore have been limited to the meaning *immerse.* Thus the washing of pots and vessels for ceremonial purification could not have been by plunging them in water, which would have rendered impure the whole body of purifying water. The word may be taken in the sense of *washing* or *sprinkling."*

*Κλινών* is translated in our Bible by "tables," and in the Authorized Version by "tables," but actually means the camp, or bed, also the cushion, couches. What is meant is the cushions on which one lay down at the table. But even if we read "tables", immersion would not be thought of. In the earliest times, however, only a round piece of leather, which was laid on the floor, was used as a table. In Christ's time, and even earlier, tables raised from the ground were in use. Dr. Nevin says: "The most ancient table for eating probably resembled that which is still common in the East, a circular piece of leather spread upon the floor, around which those who ate sat with legs bent and crossed, on cushions or

small carpets. So the brethren of Joseph sat before him when they dined with him in Egypt, Gen. 43, 33. It seems to have been common, in very early times, to have separate small tables, placed in a circle at the social meal, one before each person, as we give each a separate plate. Every one had his portion set on his own table. After the captivity, the Persian custom of lying at meals, which came into use also among the Greeks and Romans, grew fashionable in Palestine. This required a new kind of table. It was made up of three narrow tables, raised, like ours, from the ground, and placed together so as to form a square, with a clear space in the middle, and one end quite open, Around these three tables, on the outside, were placed three couches or beds, reaching far enough back to allow a man's body to be stretched nearly straight across. On these the guests lay in a slanting position, one before the other, each leaning upon his left arm, with his face turned toward the table. In this way, the head of one was placed before the bosom of another, so that, if he turned to speak with him, he naturally leaned upon it; thus John leaned on the Savior's bosom at supper, John 13, 23. The fourth side was left clear, for the servants to pass into the open space in the middle, and bring to any part of the table whatever might be wanted. On one of these table-couches, or beds, Queen Esther was leaning, when Haman fell before her to supplicate mercy, Esther 7, 8. On such a couch, also, the Redeemer lay at meat in the Pharisee's house, when there came a woman 'that was a sinner, and stood at His feet behind Him, weeping, and began to wash His feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed His feet, and anointed them with the ointment,' Luke 7, 36-38. She stood on the floor, by the outside of the high couch. In a similar manner our Lord approached the feet of His disciples, when He rose from supper, took a towel, with a basin of water, and began to wash them and wipe them, one after another, as they lay around the table, John 13, 4-12. Wherever, in the New Testament, we read of *sitting* at meat, we are to remember that it means no other position than this of stretching out the body at full length, with the head and shoulders raised upon the left arm." *(Biblical Antiquities,* p. 64 f.) So immersion is certainly out of the question. If these cleansings were done by immersion, then every family must have had a large tub of water ready. Joh. 2, 6 we read that there were six stone water jars, which held about two to three measures.

*Μετρητός*, from ο μετρητής, the measuring. The metretes contained sextarii = 9 gallons. Such a water-jug therefore held from 18 to 27 gallons. Here stood six such jugs for the sake of the many guests. The Jews had to wash a lot. They washed their hands before and after eating, because they brought all food to their mouths with their bare hands.

These "various baptisms", like all Jewish ceremonies in general, were models for the purification of their hearts, which were stained by sin. This is what Ezek. 36, 25-27: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness: and from all your idols will I cleanse you . And I will give you a new heart and a new spirit within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and will make such men of you as will walk in my commandments , and keep my statutes , and do them." In the same way, however, these "man- cher baptisms" were also models and shadows of things to come in the New Covenant.

In the New Testament was also fulfilled Joel 3, 1: "And after this I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Da- of this John the Baptist had spoken, saying, "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire (βαπτίσει)," Matth. 3, 11; Mark. 1, 8; Luk. 3, 16. apost. 2, 18: έκχεώ από του πνεύματός μον. Luk 11:38 should cause great embarrassment to immersersers, If they will be honest. "Those who insist that this word must mean immerse must be in a quandary here." (Luth. Comm.) Said. βαπτίζειν immerse, it would be said here that JEsus should immerse himself, whereas it was only the washing of hands. Surely it cannot be said that any one immersed himself, when he only washed his hands by immersion. Luke thus uses βαπτίζειν also for washing in a general sense. (Thus callsPaul calls baptism a **λοντρόν,** Eph. 5, 26; Tit. 3, 5.) This washing of the hands was done among the Jews in such a way, that water was poured on the hands ; comp. 2 Kings 3, 11; Luk. 7, 44. Matth. 15, 2. 20 is spoken of as washing before eating, and said to be a washing of the hands. This Luke calls here a βαπτίζειν. It was custom, Pour water on the hands. But one was also allowed to put one's hands in water. Both are called βαπτίζειν. In the Septuagint βαπτίζειν is used in four places: Isa. 21:4: "Horror hath made me afraid" (βαπτίζει); 2 Kings 5:14: "Naaman baptized himself in Jordan" (έβαπτίσατο); ; Judith 12:8: "Judith. washed himself in water" (έβαπτίζετο); Sir. 34, 30: "He who washes himself, βαπτιζόμενος, when he hath touched a dead man, and toucheth him again, what profit is his washing" (λοντρόν)? From the foregoing it sufficiently appears that βαπτίζειν is the be-. The word has the meaning of "to dip, to water, to sprinkle," thus denoting any kind of religious washing. Hy. Müller.

(Conclusion follows.)

# Literature.

Published by **Concordia Publishing House**, St. Louis, Mo:

1. **Concordia Publishing House** catalog, a book of nearly four hundred pages.

2. Synodical Report of the Wisconsin District with negotiations on the subject: "A well-established, truly Lutheran congregation strives to have everything done properly, honestly, and in order." (12 Cts.)

3. Synodical Report of the North Dakota and Montana District with a paper on "Paul's Missionary Activity." (10 Cts.)

4. "Concordia - Sunday School Lessons for Upper Classes" and "ConcordiaSunday School Lessons for Middle Classes" (published monthly; 25 Cts. a year each); "Concordia - Blättchen für die Kleinen" (published quarterly, each quarter comprising 6 to 8 lessons; 15 Cts. a year).

5. ***Concordia, Sunday School Lessons for Senior Department*** **and** ***Concordia Sunday School Lessons for Junior Department*** (monthly; 25 Cts. the year); ***Concordia Primary Leaflets*** (quarterly; 15 cts. the year).
Cheaper when purchased in batches. Trial copies will be sent free of charge if requested. (Both also apply to the German Sunday School periodicals).

F. B.

THE FUNDAMENTALS. A Testimony. Vol. III. Compliments of Two Christian Laymen. Testimony Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill....

This volume contains the following articles: 11. The Inspiration of the Bible. 2, The Moral Glory of Jesus Christ a Proof of Inspiration. 3, God in Christ the Only Revelation of the Fatherhood of God. 4, The Testimony of Christian Experience. 5, Christianity No Fable. 6, My Personal Experience with the Higher Criticism. 7, The Personal Testimony.

F- B.

**The Religious Crisis of the Present Time**. Ten timely and informal articles for educated Christians by Dr. A. W. Hunzinger. Published by A. Deichert, Leipzig. Price: M. 3.60.

This volume has the following content: "1. Of Doubt: The Power of Doubt in the Present. Illusion and faith. 2. Of the Weltanschauungskrisis: Volksnot and Weltanschauungsnot. The Weltanschauungsnot and womankind. 3. of the personality crisis: the modern ideal of personality. Jesus Christ and the modern man. 4. of the crisis of dogma: dogma and science. Of the unworthiness and value of dogma. 5. of the church crisis: the present crisis of the church. Why do we hold to the national church?" In his preface, D. Hunzinger, who is a professor at Erlangen, says of himself, "Above all, my inmost being resists all attempts to restore in the field of ecclesiastical, religious, and scientific life by outward and forcible means. In this, I feel myself to be a Lutheran of true grit and grain. To be sure, I do not see Lutheranism in those who make a system of unchanging formulas out of the Protestant insights of Luther and the Reformation. Just as the medieval Church valued and preserved in Augustine much more than his very own doctrinal material the vulgar Catholic elements foreign to his nature, so there are Lutherans even today who keep it with the 'Old Adam' and not with the 'New Man' in Luther and the Reformation. They will deny me the palm of Lutheranism and already do." But that Hunzinger does not take the old Lutheran, but the Schleiermacherian standpoint of Hofmann's and von Frank's, is shown, among other things, by the following debate (p. 144): "For the Protestant dogmatist it has become the rule, in principle through the Reformation, but with full scientific consciousness since Schleiermacher, to see in the dogma, instead of a decree of faith, an account of faith. One could apply what we heard Ostwald say of the law of nature to the Protestant theologian's concept of dogma and say: dogmas do not decree what is to be held true externally, but they report what is experienced internally and is to be experienced.

...is used to do. The dogmas do not produce faith, religious experience, and knowledge any more than the laws of nature produce natural events. On the contrary, dogmas presuppose religious experience just as much as natural laws presuppose natural events. They are results, reports, statements of the experiences of faith. The dogma summarizes in a formulaic abstract, dialectically exact, regularly recurring religious contents of experience and their experiential relations to each other and to religious objects, that is, experiential material, in one sentence. It is therefore regulative, but not constitutive for religious cognition. It cannot produce faith, religious experience nud cognition, but can only serve to normalize already existing religious experience." "Dogmas," Hunzinger thus opines, "are not commands of faith, but accounts of faith." But the fact is that the specifically Christian truths of Scripture, which come to concise, clear expression in Christian doctrines or dogmas, are themselves the Gospel which produces faith, and of which JEsus says, "My words are spirit and are life," and of which Paul boasts that they are a power of God unto salvation. The Christian doctrines or dogmas, which sum up the Gospel truths revealed in Scripture, are thus sources of faith, and by no means mere commands or reports of faith. In his last lecture D. Hunzinger seeks to justify the adherence to the Lutheran national churches, although he takes no pains to veil the damage done to them. For example, he writes: "The tremendous popularizing tendency and practice of our time carries with lightning speed all questions and their latest solutions, especially the radical ones, to the broad stratum of the people. The teaching world is for the most part strongly infected. The theological party militants have seized the lay world. Whole estates are organized along church party lines. The 'Friends of Protestant Freedom' in the Rhineland and in Westphalia have at present set in motion a so-called 'senior teachers' movement'. The elementary school teachers in Hamburg, Bremen, and Saxony have agitated with a very radical program. In the political parliaments ecclesiastical and theological party fights are being fought out. The press has become quite theological, though with lack of understanding. We have even witnessed the spectacle of country church pastors joining the Monist League and appearing and still appearing as leaders and agitators of it. The church bulletins of our large cities have become menus from which one can choose one's favorite dish Sunday after Sunday. Liberal theology in its various shades, of which the "Friends of the Christian World' represent the most ecclesiastically minded, is emerging openly in church life. Theologians and laymen are uniting to demand publicly the equality of the directions. A New Protestantism has arisen in our midst within a few years. In a nutshell: the legal stability of the confession guaranteed by the national church has not been able to stop a strong actual softening of the confession and possession of truth in wide circles of ministers and laity under the colossal pressure of modern immanent spiritual currents. Therefore, despite the legal validity of the confession in them and the factual effects resulting from it, the Lutheran regional churches today are no longer Lutheran confessional churches in the original sense of the word. A national church in which 14,000 elementary school teachers demand the elimination of the Lutheran catechism from the religious instruction of the school is no longer Lutheran in the old sense of the word." Further, "Every large urban congregation in any Lutheran national church contains, without the pastor knowing it and, if he does know it, being able to change it, a strong percentage of Uniate and Reformed. This state of affairs has already become a matter of course - no one asks about it anymore. Where would it also lead if everywhere the Reformed and Uniate who had immigrated to Lutheran cities wanted to and should establish special congregations? This makes the fact even clearer, which I have stated above, that our Lutheran regional churches are by no means confessional churches in the true sense of the word, but general Protestant churches with a Lutheran constitution and a greater or lesser influence of actual Lutheran preaching and conviction, with the admixture of strong Uniate and Reformed, new-believing and notoriously unbelieving elements, who, although themselves church members, are nevertheless public members.

freely express their opposition to the Confession. Is it so or not? Especially the circles of the so-called intelligentsia, of the learned, and of the large estates, tend to belong to the churches without making the least secret of their unbelief. Finally, under these circumstances, the obligation to confess has taken on a meaning other than its original one, and must have done so if the national churches were not to be abandoned. The handling of this obligation, with more or less tacit acquiescence on the part of the church authorities or through changed formulations, has become so lenient that hardly anyone, no matter how liberal, takes offense at it. Under these circumstances, we country-church Lutherans have truly no cause to exalt ourselves above the Lutherans within the Union, and no right to call ourselves the better Lutherans toward them." If, in spite of such conditions, D. Hunzinger nevertheless exhorts us to remain in the national churches, the reason for this is that Hunzinger is guided by considerations of expediency and utility, and not by the clear statements of Scripture concerning conduct against false believers. Also of interest to American readers are the following words of D. Hunzinger: "Close relatives and friends of mine are pastors in American Lutheran Free Churches. What they say in almost every letter is: Thank God that your country church pastors do not have to live in the miserable dependence on their congregations and congregational autocrats, and not in the degrading economic and social destitution as we do here, who are for the most part employed on quarterly notice. For my own part, I would a thousand times rather be dependent on all the church regiments of Germany than on a single municipal tyrant." Pastors employed on "quarterly notice," however, are in a miserable position, destroying all self-respect. Has D. Hunzinger, for instance, the Lutheran General Synod in view, or does he even confuse the Lutherans with the Uniates? But even in this limitation he seems to us to have applied the colors too thickly. As to the Missouri Synod, we are not aware of a single case from its whole history, past to the present, in which a pastor has been employed by one of its congregations on quarterly or similar notice.

F. B.

**Martinus Luther**. A new photogravure of Luther. **Louis Lange Publishing Co.**, St. Louis, Mo. Price: $1.00.

An excellent picture, which beautifully expresses all the nobility of Luther: the lively spirit, the clear eye, the bright mind; the strong will, the firm courage, the holy defiance; the strong word, the determined deed, the unshakable trust in God! The picture measures 19X15 inches; paper size: 29X22 inches. F. B.

# Ecclesiastical contemporary history.

## I. America.

**Of the St. Louis Luther Edition** the iowasche "Kirchliche Zeitschrift" says: "Since 1885 Prof. A. F. Hoppe has devoted all his time and energy to this work. And he has, as the undersigned can testify, at least on the basis of the use of individual volumes, done thorough and reliable work. The 'Tischreden' have been collected and sifted with special care, so that Kurtz could judge in 1890 in his Church History that the St. Louis volume is the best complete edition of them that one has possessed so far. From the pecuniary point of view, the enterprise was a risk such as could only be dared by a large synod and a well-founded house. Well was

from the start a large (?) sales area certainly, but probably only few get an approximately correct idea of the enormous sums the publication must have swallowed, especially as printer and bindery have delivered good work. ... There is thus reopened a source of blessing to our whole Lutheran Church in America, and erected a monument of undaunted diligence and faithful devotion which will have lasting value for a long time to come."

**"The Ohio Synod, at its meeting** in Richmond, Jnd. adopted the following resolutions, concerning its relation to the Iowa Synod: 'We, as a Synod, receive with thanks the response of the Honorable Iowa Synod. We are pleased to state that we, for our part, regard the Honorable Synod of Iowa, according to its confessional position, as a purely Lutheran body. Although it follows from this that in principle nothing stands in the way of a mutual pulpit and communion, we nevertheless think that for the time being one should refrain from it on all sides, because it is the opinion among us that some points of difference in subordinate doctrines, as well as questions of practice, should be looked at more closely. In order that the latter may be done, we think that the negotiations of the two Synods should be continued with each other, through committees appointed for this purpose." The 'Luth. Kirchenzeitung,' from which we take these resolutions, also informs us that the committee of the Ohio Synod for this purpose shall consist of Messrs. D. Schütte, D. Stellhorn, D. Ernst, Praeses Dannecker, Prof. Mees, Prof. Dörmann, and P. C. F. W. Allwardt." So reports the Iowasche "Kirchenblatt" of September 24. In the number of October 8, the same paper agrees with the judgment of the "Lutheran" "that the Ohio Synod, if it considered the Iowa Synod a purely Lutheran Synod, should also have been in earnest about it and established full church fellowship at once." However, the Iowa "Church Gazette" believes that the granting of full church fellowship will not be long in coming either. It writes: "The principles which Fr. Schutte has laid down in the ***Lutheran Standard*** from

will also lead to clarity here, so that the Ohio Synod will gladly grasp the hand of brotherhood that we extended to it three years ago. Brother's hand, which we unanimously extended to it three years ago, will gladly be grasped." The principle on which the iowasche paper pins its hope is the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, of which, according to the ***Lutheran standard,*** to the full

The Standard itself writes p. 627: "When we fix the status of any Lutheran or supposedly-Lutheran body, or of any other religious body for that matter, we do not, as a rule, lose sight of the fact that the former are not necessary, for there has never been complete unanimity in all non-fundamental doctrines, even among the best Lutherans. The *Standard* itself writes, p. 627: "When we fix the status of any Lutheran or supposedly-Lutheran body, or of any other religious body for that matter, we do not, as a rule, lose sight of the fact that there are fundamental and nonfundamental doctrines. There has never, even among the best of Lutherans, been absolute agreement on even all the nonfundamental doctrines. And yet, differences in nonfundamental doctrines are not ignored by Lutherans. Attention is paid to them, and we try to remove them wherever possible. Now, our resolutions distinctly state that our synod officially considers the Iowa Synod a purely Lutheran body. To be purely Lutheran does not require more in our days than it has required in times past. Lutherans have always agreed on fundamental doctrines; and the authority

**of man as compared with the authority of God has always been to them so light, that they have, in doctrines on which the Scripture does not give clear revelation, ever preserved the liberty to believe as it seemed correct to them, always being careful, however, to adopt nothing into their belief which might contradict the clear revelations of Scripture. When our synod stated that it considers the Iowa Synod a purely Lutheran body, it did not state that in nonfundamentals the two synods are perfectly agreed.**" That this opens a wide door to unionism is obvious. And how does this position differ from that of the General Synod? The Lutheran Confession demands for church fellowship unity "in doctrine and all the same articles." He who shakes this principle himself, and by "all the articles of doctrine" wants to understand only some doctrines and not all, only the fundamental and not also the non-fundamental articles, is logically in the camp of the Uniate. F. B.

**"Alleged borzüge of the General Synod** were discussed by Prof. Neve some time ago in the 'Z. B.' under the heading: 'Thoughts on the Confessional Question,' with side glances and side blows from other Synods." So begins a lengthy item in the previous number of "Lehre und Wehre," p. 516 f. In the same a passage has been objected to by D. Neve, which thus reads. "The direction represented by the conservatives in the General Synod has still a mission in America.' It consists in seeking a union of the different bodies of the Church on the present confessional basis of the General Synod, with the exclusion, for instance, of the more strictly confessional Synods and the Evangelical Synod as it now stands. But a union with the Reformed without doctrinal adjustment is rejected (Why? Are they worse than the present minority of the General Synod? Can they not be educated at the same time?), though the English occasionally hold church fellowship with them nevertheless." Now concerning this passage D. Neve, in a letter addressed to us, states that in his article he did not speak of "a union of the different church bodies on the present confessional basis of the General Synod." Neve writes, "By 'mission' I understand, one thing, that General Synod, like other Lutheran synods of America, has its issue." What follows is not a discussion of what that "mission" consists in. It is only a refutation of the assertion that General Synod advocates union with the Reformed without reconciliation of doctrinal differences."

F. B.

**Position of the General Synod on Sects**. According to the "L. Kz." (p. 586), D. Jacob A. Cluss of Gettysburg, Pa., writes in the ***Lutheran Church Work of*** August of this year: "In our congregations" (namely, those of the General Synod) "the member of any orthodox church, any communion of churches, may be exempted by the presentation of an honorable certificate of departure or letter of presentation from the church to which such member formerly belonged. Neither the baptismal nor the confirmation form, as recorded in the Lutheran Agenda or **Book of Ministerial Acts, contains** anything prescribing a doctrinal examination for membership, except the acceptance and profession of the Apostolic Faith, which is the common property and property of the Church.

confession of all evangelical communities." According to this, then, Zwinglian Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., can become members in the congregations of the General Synod without further doctrinal examination. But how then do such congregations differ from united ones? F. B.

**Statue to Peter Muhlenberg in Philadelphia.** The "D. L." reports, "On German Day, October 6, on which 227 years ago the founders of Germantown landed in Philadelphia, the statue of Major General Peter Mühlenberg was unveiled on the south side of City Hall. John Peter Gabriel was born in Trappe, Montgomery Co. on October 1, 1746, the eldest of three sons of the patriarch of the Lutheran Church of America, Heinrich Melchior Mühlenbergs. By birth he was destined, like his brothers Friedrich August Konrad and Gotthilf Heinrich Ernst, for the clerical state. He received his first instruction from his father, entered the academy there after his father's removal to Philadelphia in 1761, and two years later was sent with the brothers to Halle to D. Ziegenhagen. His father's fears that Peter would be more suited for soldiering were not unfounded. One day he joined a dragoon regiment that was passing through. After various wanderings unknown to us, Peter was recognized by a friend of his father's, an English colonel, as a mercenary in a North German town, and brought back to his father's home in Pennsylvania. After two years of diligent study of theology, he was ordained to the holy preaching ministry in 1768. Two years afterward he married Anna Barbara Meyer. Again two years later he was called to Woodstock, Va. to the German Lutheran congregation. The relations of the American colonies with the English mother country became more and more strained at that time. In contrast to the rest of Virginia's clergy, Peter Muehlenberg took the side of those who advocated armed resistance. He was in constant contact with outstanding patriots, such as George Washington, Patrick Henry and others. Among his German compatriots he had great influence, especially since he was also very popular as a pastor. Thus the news that Mühlenberg would preach for the last time brought together an unusually large audience. At that time he concluded his sermon with the unforgettable words: 'As there is a time to preach, so there is also a time to fight, and that time has now come'. After concluding with the benediction, he divested himself of his surplice and stood before his audience in full uniform. A singular scene followed. Some 300 men from Woodstock and vicinity alone joined his regiment, making it more complete than all the rest were. It would be going too far to list all his merits and heroic deeds here. Peter Muhlenberg is among the ablest and most intrepid of Geo. Washington. In recognition of his services he was granted 30,000 acres of land in the Ohio valley. From 1785 to 1788 he was vice-president of Pennsylvania, and later a member of the national house of representatives as well as of the senate. From 1802 until his death, October 1, 1807, he was collector of the port of Philadelphia. A stately monument was now unveiled in his honor on October 6, south of City Hall. Hyphenated and unhyphenated Americans and Germans participated in the celebration with equal zeal. The introduction

formed a large parade. The parade of German clubs began at 2.30 at the hall of the German Society. The actual festivities at the monument were opened by General Louis Wagner. Speeches were made by Judge Staake, Dr. Hexamer, the German Consul Dr. A. Mudra, and others."

**The Eucharistic Congress met in Montreal in September**. The "D. L." reports: Rome did not lack splendor this time to throw sand in the eyes of the deluded masses. Three cardinals, among them Cardinal Vanutelli as special representative of the Pope, had appeared; more than 120 bishops, archbishops and heads of religious orders from Europe, South America and Asia were present. The number of foreign priests amounted to thousands. The Mayor of the City of Montreal greeted the brilliant festive assembly in the "Rome of the New World" with enthusiastic words, as did General Havernend of the Province of Quebec. The Jesuit Vaughan, a former Protestant, did not lack tactless outbursts against Protestantism in a sermon he preached in the Irish church on the first Sunday of the Congress. He honoured us heretics with more or less beautiful titles of honour. In front of the great Cathedral of St. James was the blessing of 25,000 school children. Under a canopy sat Vanutelli in his red cardinal's robe, next to him the Irish cardinal and the archbishop of Montreal. Like soldiers, the children were herded past the ecclesiastical dignitaries. When the ceremony was over, the faithful Catholics rushed for the chairs on which the cardinals had sat, and - it may sound incredible nowadays - in the absence of the shepherd's ring, some kissed the chairs on which Cardinals Logue and Vanutelli had sat in the deepest reverence. On the last Sunday the great procession took place. It began at 12.30 and lasted until 7 o'clock in the evening. Thousands of splendidly embroidered precious banners were carried in front of the individual Catholic associations and orders. Only towards nightfall did the procession of priests, bishops, archbishops and cardinals approach, who, after the heat of the day, went about in the twilight with the consecrated host. The congress cost the city of Montreal, notorious for its bad roads, $10,000 from the city treasury. How much else went from the faithful to Rome from the Holy See only the initiated know. On the first Sunday, the collection in one of the hundred churches of the Roman denomination was $12,500. - Idolatrous devotion was also paid to Vanutelli by thousands of Catholics in St. Louis, Philadelphia, and other cities. And the mayors and other officials in question unfortunately abused their political position to greet the Pope's representative on behalf of those cities and their citizens and to sing the praises of the Papal Church. All non-Catholics should have protested cheaply against this. That this was done, however, is not reported. As in Canada, so also in our country the politicians are under the spell of Rome. Finally, we would like to point out the lie that is regularly told by the Romanists at their Eucharistic congresses and also at every other opportunity, e.g. by the Paulist Fathers, and which was presented in Montreal by the Jesuit Vaughan: Protestantism is the nonsensical attempt to invent a religion without sacrifice. Thus

For the papists lie, because we do not want to substitute their masses and missals for the only High Priest and his one eternally valid sacrifice. F. B.

**Concerning the Christian Science hoax,** the "L. Kz." from the ***Lutheran*** shares the following sentences: "1. The Christian believes that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and life; the **Christian Science** adherent does not believe this. 2. the Christian has the word of God; the follower of **Christian Science** has the word of a woman. 3. The Christian believes in the God of Scripture; the follower of **Christian Science** believes in the God of Mrs. Eddy. 4. The Christian believes that man is as the Scriptures say he is; the **Christian Science follower** believes that he is as Mrs. Eddy dreams him to be. 5. the Scriptures are in earnest about human depravity; '**Science and Health**,' Mrs. Eddy's fabrication, denies the same. 6. The Christian believes that sin is as the Schrist speaks of it; the follower of **Christian Science does** not. 7. According to Scripture, sin is something unspeakably sad; according to '**Science and Health,**' it is something ridiculous." Of the three great impostors of religion, Dowie, Tolstoi, and Mrs. Eddy, the last two of whom have also recently died, the palm is undoubtedly due to Mrs. Eddy. F. B.

## II. Abroad.

**The last August conference of the Berean Lutherans** in Prussia was well attended. A representative of the "General Lutheran Conference" was also present. From the beginning, the meeting was seen as a counter-demonstration against the "World Congress for Free Christianity. Dr. Grützmacher of Rostock therefore also spoke on the subject: "The Triune God - Our God." He based his lecture on the following theses: "1. The special nature of the Christian knowledge of God is expressed only in its Trinitarian nature and not in any other nature. 2. the Christian belief in the Trinity is not dependent on or analogous to non-Christian trinities. (3) Rather, the Christian faith in the Trinity is fully explained by the threefold personal revelation of God, as Father, Son, and Spirit, in the Christian history of salvation, as the summarizing result of which it is to be understood, and at the culmination of which it was therefore first revealed and experienced. (4) Consequently, the Church has placed special emphasis on the expression of the Trinitarian faith in her confessions and has held fast to it in the face of all regressive Unitarian currents. 5a. The Trinitarian faith is based on the religious fact, which can still be experienced and which has been established by revelation, that God as Father created the world and judged that which had become sinful, as Son in Christ reconciled the world to Himself at the centre of history, and as present Spirit inwardly unites and re-creates the individualities with Christ. 5b. In all three forms the essence of God as absolute personality and holy love works itself out in the same way, and in such a way that the efficacy of the one rests on and strives towards that of the other two. 6. God would not reveal Himself in history as the Triune if He were not at the same time Triune in His eternal pre-worldly essence, the complete knowledge of which is not attainable by theology, but for which it must struggle with all its might." By-

After Count Roon had called upon all church authorities to stand up for the old faith "without fear of man, without fear of the press, without fear of leaving the national church", the assembly adopted the following resolutions: "The Evangelical Lutheran Conference within the Prussian national church declares: The confession of the Evangelical church is and remains the confession of the triune God, who as Father created the world, as Son redeemed it and as Spirit sanctifies it. A church which departs from this confession ceases to be a Christian church. We therefore decisively object to the attempt of the "World Congress for Free Christianity and Religious Progress" to regress in religious life to an unchristian belief in God, and in theology to regress to rationalism. We consider it the sacred duty of all evangelical Christians to stand by this ancient and ever-living confession, and to unite ever more closely in its defence. We see the task of the appointed organs of the evangelical church in the fact that they dutifully and out of love for the Christian congregations watch over the preservation of this confession in church and school." That in Grützmacher's sentences the Lutheran doctrine of the Trinity is given full, unambiguous expression, cannot be said, Probably, however, that in the following paper the Lutheran doctrine of inspiration was completely abandoned. Prof. Liz. Wilkes of Vienna gave a lecture on "The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith," with the following leading sentences: "1. The Old Testament canon was, to the extent that we have it, the Bible of Jesus and of the earliest Christianity. 2. 2) The fact that only very late Hebrew manuscripts have come down to us cannot shake our confidence in the reliability of the tradition, since all Hebrew manuscripts go back to a very old, received model, and the Massoretes treated the sacred text with the greatest reverence. 3) The credibility of the Old Testament as a source of history is not affected by the statements of the Old Testament books about their origin, since these statements are based partly on a later tradition and partly on a literary dressing that was customary in former times. 4 In assessing the reliability of the Old Testament accounts, the individual details, the folk tales and the historical account require a separate evaluation. (5) The views of the Old Testament reveal the natural imperfections of the preparatory stage of God's revelation in religious and moral respects, but in their profound grasp of the salvation offered in the Old Testament stage of revelation they offer a classical expression even for our present Christian feeling. (6) For the purpose of edification the Old Testament is exemplary, inasmuch as it is able to give us 'counsel and help against sin' and stands the test before the Spirit of Jesus Christ. 7 The fact that Jesus Christ regarded Himself as the finisher of Old Testament salvation history justifies the conviction that a special revelation of God, both in deed and word, took place in Israel." That Wilkes denies verbal inspiration is evident from the fifth thesis. Father Steinmeyer therefore took the opportunity to intercede for the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, but D. Haußleiter took Wilkes' side.

and called upon the pastors to destroy "the false image of verbal inspiration" in the congregations. The "Reformation" reports: "In the name of many members of the believing congregation, Father Steinmeyer, in particular, spoke out against the theory of verbal inspiration in a most profound way and presented the professors with the urgent request that the spiritual work of the theologians and pastors of the present and past centuries, which had been won in hot battles, be valued more highly than is usually done. Prof. D. Haußleiter-Greifswald answered him just as earnestly, urging that the pastors and educated believers would help to destroy the false image of verbal inspiration in the congregations, which has already plunged many into useless doubts and contestations." The conference contented itself with the following vague resolution: "Since, according to the Scriptures of the New Testament, God sometimes and in various ways spoke to the fathers through the prophets, we also see in the Old Testament a revelation of the living God, by which the perfect self-revelation in Jesus Christ is prepared. Therefore we protest against the elimination of the Old Testament in church and school, lest our Christian people be deprived of an essential part of the revelation of God. " F. B.

**Jubilee celebration of the Canstein Bible Institute.** The 21st of October of this The celebration of the 50th year was an important one for Halle and beyond. Two hundred years ago, August Hermann Francke and Baron Karl Hildebrandt von Canstein planted a mustard seed in the field of the church, which grew into a large tree and whose branches bore much fruit. Francke had already written the "Instruction on how to read the Holy Scriptures for one's edification" when he published the first Bible on his own initiative in 1702. But it was not until 1710 that he found the man to whom he could entrust the execution of his thought. After the Cansteinsche Bibelanstalt was founded on October 21, 1710, the work of Bible distribution was taken up with vigor, and in the 200 years of its existence 7,500,000 Bibles and New Testaments have been distributed through it. The jubilee celebration took place in the assembly hall of the Francke Foundations. The celebration was followed by a visit to the Bible exhibition of the institutions, which also contains the Wittenberg December edition of the New Testament of 1522, a Nuremberg New Testament of 1524 and two volumes of the Wittenberg Bible edition of 1534. The Canstein Bible Society has so far received no actual collections for its work, but only voluntary love offerings.

F. B.

**Between the Blankenburgers and the "Pentecostals"** the divorce has taken place. Both gathered at the same time but in different places, the former in Blankenburg, the "Pentecostals" in West Germany. The "Saxon Brother Council" reports: "For a time we could not go along with the Blankenburg Conference. There was really no longer any question of an alliance conference, because the whole character of the conference had become a free-church one and the believers still adhering to the national church were not considered full. We deeply regretted this. We also had the impression, and we were not mistaken, that in Blankenburg the simple truths of the Bible were almost ignored in the last few years, and that they always tried to offer something special.

Speakers with a national church mind almost did not get a chance to speak. Blankenburg has now taken a turn and, we believe, a turn for the better. This turnaround began when, after the stormy conference of 1905, where hundreds often prayed together in the prayer meetings (this was called a "breakthrough"), Stockmayer in 1906, where some again prayed for this "breakthrough", rebuked this action as unbiblical and declared that he would have to resign from the committee immediately if it allowed this behavior. This turn of events, however, only became clearly apparent last year, when Preacher Schrenk was invited and came not only as a guest, but also as a speaker. This year, to our delight, Preacher Schrenk was again a speaker in Blankenburg. That would not have been possible about five years ago. . . . The last Blankenburg Conference was not quite as good as usual, but still well attended. One looked in vain for some of the earlier participants. The 'Pentecostal movement' has already done something to the conference. The 'Pentecostals' had a conference in West Germany at the same time. But here, too, everything must work out for the best for those who love God. It has become clear, and we are thankful that the Lord has given the community movement enough strength to reject foreign bodies. We hope that the Lord will also still set the 'Pentecostals' straight."

**Salus juventutis suprema lex!** This was the slogan of the Saxon Minister of Education, D. Beck in a speech on the reorganization of the elementary school system, in which he also said, among other things: "Therefore it is important at this time to develop effectively in the future teachers in the seminary, in quiet, diligent work, but not in monastic seclusion from the outside world, nay, in life-giving contact with the whole of the people's life, the ideals proper to youthful age. To carry out the hopeful work of a young man by understanding and protecting him in times of challenge and doubt, by imparting the necessary knowledge, by ennobling his mind, and by enthusiasm for the high and rewarding tasks of youth education. Through the cultivation of Germanism and civic education, our seminarians are to be fortified in their steadfast love for King and Fatherland, for Emperor and Empire; through the deepening and internalization of the life of faith on the basis of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST and with proper appreciation of the assured results of science, they are to be protected against doubt and then enter life as patriotic and Christian personalities full of character." The liberal-minded teachers of Saxony have now made a front against D. Beck, and are seeking by force to conquer the schools for liberalism. F. B.

**The 57th General Assembly of Catholics** was held in Augsburg. The number of participants was estimated at 100,000. In his closing speech the President said that with this assembly a **confessio Augustana catholicorum was** planned. And this Catholic Day also turned out to be quite a papist display. While the old Lutheran **Augustana professed the** sole authority of Scripture and banished all rule by men and the subjugation of conscience from the Church, the Catholic Congress in Augsburg professed blind submission to the Pope. Clearly and distinctly the President indicated the courses in which everything had to move, declaring: "There must be no directions among us. 'Towards Rome' is the watchword!"

For the Pope they demanded "a full and real liberty and independence in the exercise of his supreme pastoral office," which, according to the Roman dictionary, means so much as the restoration of his temporal power to gag the heretics. Of course the Catholics' Day advocated the return of the Jesuits, and soon at the outset it was declared, "Today already we want to send a greeting also to our Jesuits outside." Yes and Amen said the great assembly also to the lying Borromeo encyclical, and nothing more was heard of Catholic protests against the same. Submissively all lay in the dust before the Pope. To the lively approval of the assembly, Marx declared: "In a circular letter to the chief pastors of the Catholic Church, the Holy Father, on the occasion of the commemoration of the great Archbishop of Milan, St. Charles Borromeo, recalled his pastoral care in a difficult, troubled time to the Catholic pastoral office. In the process, judgments have been pronounced on the circumstances of that time which preclude application to the present. Without regard to these circumstances, the wording of the Circular Letter, when translated from the foreign language, has been aggravated partly by misinterpretation, partly by distortion, as well as by lifting individual phrases out of their context in an attempt to prove a deliberate insult to those of other faiths. If these circles still continue to stir up this agitation, it is obvious that they do not want to miss the opportunity to use these impressions for political purposes and to disturb the confessional peace. (Lively agreement.) For our part, we consider the matter settled, and a further discussion of it not suitable to preserve the confessional peace. We want to live in peace and harmony with our Protestant fellow citizens, to defend the Christian faith together, and to promote hand in hand the welfare of our common fatherland. Yes, we want to serve peace. Only a few days ago Cardinal Kopp spoke the excellent words: 'We cannot change and eliminate the differences in religious matters, but we can keep them out of our social and civil relations. We cannot deny our Catholic character, but it will not hurt and offend others'. But we vigorously protest against the use of this occasion by some quarters to deepen denominational divisions, to insult the Catholic Church and its head, and to sow discord. We sternly warn against continuing along this path. What follows for us Catholics from these recent events? The admonition to attach ourselves all the more firmly to the center of our Church, the Apostolic See." In the judgment of these papal servants, then, the latest disturber of the peace was not the reviling pope, but the Protestants who complain of the pope's lies and slanders. The pope who judges all, no one may judge, and even if he lies **ex cathedra,** all the world is guilty of worshipping it as truth. This is the **confessio Augustana catholicorum**. To

The battle was also fought against the liberal teachers and theologians, against Nietzsche and Drews, against social democracy and atheism and other modern aberrations, all of which the Pope, as is well known, blames without much ado on Luther's Reformation, although these aberrations come to light most strongly precisely where the hierarchy has succeeded,

Reformation and Lutheranism to be exterminated, as in France, Spain, Italy, Portugal. "The thing to do now," opined one speaker, "is to stand up for the foundation of all culture, for the Christian world-view all along the line." But the fact is that nothing has done so much to make the Christian world-view stink in the eyes of many as the superstition, the priestly fraud, and the tyranny of conscience which papism has ever and ever advocated. Theoretical and practical atheism is every time the ultimate, natural fruit of Papism. The assembly particularly emphasized "the apostolate of the press". Last year 20,700,000 writings were distributed, and since 1893 more than 143 million writings! The popular associations represented at the Katholikentag numbered 652,645 members. Thus, however, the Catholic Day in Augsburg turned out to be a glorification of the Pope and a display of his great power in Germany. F. B.

**"Quare ipsorum spurco coelibatui assentiri nolumus,"** says Luther in the Schmalkaldic Articles. That the above expression (**spurco coelibatui**) was and still is true, the history of the Roman Church in all countries and all centuries has furnished innumerable proofs, even down to the present time. Now again the "A. G." writes: "Almost at the same time two protests against celibacy have been published from the circles of the Catholic clergy, which will be most unpleasant to Rome and its Pope, especially in the present day. In Memminger's publishing house in Würzburg, already in its second edition (after the first edition was sold out in four weeks), a brochure has appeared from the pen of the Catholic priest Siegfried Hagen under the title: 'Forced Celibacy or Priestly Marriage? An appeal to all the noble-minded; published in the name of many Catholic clergymen', which contains a bitter indictment of Rome. The author gives a deep and startling insight into the feelings and actions of the Catholic priest who is forced into celibacy against his nature. From rich bad experience he speaks with full sincerity of the plight of so many Catholic clergy, and exposes the whole immorality of celibacy. He accuses the Catholic Church of knowing the vicious consequences of forced celibacy and yet maintaining it. Because he expects no help from the Church, he calls upon the German parliaments to put an end to this immoral institute with its dire political consequences out of consideration for the welfare of the German people. And a former priest, Dr. Sickenberger, who nine years ago resigned his post as professor at the Lyceum and since then has no longer exercised any priestly functions, but now, after having passed his philological examinations with distinction, demands employment as a philologist and permission to enter into marriage, but with such a demand is rudely rejected under threat of excommunication, turns in the 'New Century' with an open letter to the Archbishop, in which it says, among other things: 'I remind you of the content of the law. To the priests of the Occident it forbids marriage under the severest penalty; to the priests of the Orient, who belong to the Catholic Church, the same law permits marriage without any condition or requirement. At the same time it imposes the severest penalty on the attempt of an honest marriage; but those thousands of Catholic clergymen who do not observe the law in other ways, remain partly entirely unpunished,

In some cases they suffer only temporary suspension from office, in the worst case they are sent to a house of correction. Is this not arbitrariness? . . . In the name of those thousands who are emasculated and enslaved by the rulers of the Church, I demand for them freedom from a God-opposing compulsion! I condemn all those popes and bishops who have given and maintain the law of celibacy for false piety and cruelty. To require of men devoted to God sacrifices which God does not want is false religion; to enforce them is inhuman and cruel. I charge those who uphold the law with hypocrisy; for they know how often the law is transgressed, transgress it in part themselves, and yet pretend that all is well, and compel their subjects to the same hypocrisy. I accuse them of the greatest crime against our people; for they degrade marriage, deny offspring to the most pious sons of the people, and, instead of granting them the happiness of marriage with a priest, put thousands of pious women in dreadful dangers.' " Thus it is shown again and again that the Papist vows are in truth a grimace of what the beautiful names say. "Poverty," according to the Roman lexicon, means: to scrape together all the money in the world for the churches and convents; "obedience": to denounce, for the increase of the power of the pope and the priests, the owing obedience to God and to all the authorities set by God (parents, authorities, and the Scriptures). And finally, what does chastity mean in the mouths of Roman celibates but to consider any form of fornication lowly compared to entering into a God-pleasing marriage? The "Old Faith" remarks: "The Pope, at any rate, will say to himself that his reviling of the marriage of the Reformers was quite untimely." No one in the whole world has less right to reproach others with reference to the sixth commandment than the Roman popes and priests. Here they are struck by the word: "Why do you take my covenant into your mouth, when you hate discipline and throw my words behind you? F. B.

**The Catholic theology professor Schnitzer in Munich,** who was suspended by the Pope because of his theological position and was given leave of absence by the Bavarian government until further notice, continues undeterred on the path he has chosen. His most sensational writing, "Did Jesus Found the Papacy?" has brought several opponents on the scene, such as the private lecturer Tillmann-Bonn and the lyceal professor Dausch-Passau. Their explanations have now prompted Schnitzer to a new publication, which has appeared under the title: "The Papacy a Foundation of Jesus? The conclusion of his development is "that Jesus did not promise the foundation of the church and of the primacy and therefore did not carry it out, and that furthermore for a foundation of the church on Peter no testimony at all can be produced from the literature of the early church". The ray of banishment from Rome will probably not be long in coming. (A. E. L. K.)

**The Pope's last Motuproprio.** The "A. E. L. K." writes: "In the Vatican one seems to estimate the dangers threatening the Catholic Church from Modernism higher than the Ultramontanes wanted to admit. On September 8, a motuproprio of the Pope was again published, which first of all recalls all the decrees that have been issued until-

The first of these is about the conditions of promotion of clerics to the higher orders and theological degrees. These concern studies in seminaries and universities, the conditions for the promotion of clerics to higher orders and theological degrees, the supervision and censorship to be applied to modernist writings, the congresses of priests, and the triennial report of the bishops and religious superiors on the observance of the regulations issued. Referring to the Encyclical **"Pascendi",** the Pope strongly recommends that Bishops and religious superiors strictly supervise the formation of the clergy, so that they may be well prepared for the struggle against modernism and not be distracted by other studies. The reading of newspapers and magazines is forbidden to theology students. The oath to church doctrine and discipline is to be taken by every professor before taking office, and by every clergyman before advancing to the higher orders of the diaconate and presbyterate, as well as by all pastors, confessors, canons, and benefices before taking possession of their benefices, and finally also by the officials of episcopal administrations, by Lenten preachers, and by members of the congregations and courts of the curia. The Motuproprio itself contains the formula of oaths for this, and finally gives instructions to the clergy as to the manner of preaching useful." This Motuproprio of the Pope caused a meeting of the Modernists in Italian Switzerland, at which it was resolved to proceed against the tyrannical decree of the Pope, not, however, by newspapers and circulars to the priests, but by working the seminarians in the holidays in favor of Modernism, and by raising funds for disciplined students. According to the Pope's Motuproprio, the anti-Modernist oath must be taken by all priests by December 31. In the case of priests who live far from the episcopal city, it is sufficient to send in the oath formula signed by them. Those who refuse to sign are to be reported immediately to the Inquisition. The papal supervisory council is strictly ordered to meet every two months. Members who are unable to attend must send in their report in writing. F. B.

**The Pope's desire for temporal power to** put a gag in the mouths of heretics gave vent some months ago to the Jewish mayor of Rome. The latter had made a speech at the commemoration of the entry of the Piedmontese troops into Rome, in which, according to the Pope, he "not only solemnly recalled the return of the day when the sacred rights of papal sovereignty were trampled under foot, but raised his voice to mock and revile the doctrines of the Catholic faith, the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the Church herself." The result was a letter of indignation from the pope against the mayor, in which the pope declared, "The mayor had uttered blasphemous words, and, led by hatred against the Church, had insulted in malicious utterances the religious feeling of the faithful people. He therefore called the attention of the entire Catholic world to these ever-increasing insults to the Catholic religion, and urged them to "address hot prayers to the Almighty that he may rise up to the

The Pope's "defense of his divine bride, the Church, which is so unworthily mocked by ever more venomous calumnies and ever more violent attacks directed against her in unpunished presumption by her enemies". In the Roman context, the Pope's above words can only have in mind "hot prayers" for the reintroduction of the Inquisition and for temporal violence to suppress heretics. The mayor, however, according to the "A. G.", immediately answered publicly: The Pope had only confirmed by his letter what he had stated in his speech, that he had no understanding for the present; for the rest, he submitted to the judgment of the courts as well as of the citizenry; but if he should really have violated religion and conscience, he would settle it with God without mediators! F. B.

**The Social Democrats** distributed a leaflet en masse among the confirmands of Hanover last Easter, which read: "What did the Volksschule do to give you health and strength? It did nothing! In overcrowded rooms, with pressed chests you squatted together with your companions. What did the elementary school do to enrich and fortify your knowledge? It did nothing! By mechanical memorization of Bible sayings, religious tales, and articles of faith, you received knowledge of a fairy-tale hereafter, and by putting off to this hereafter you learned contentment with an economic order whose injustice and bitterness are often already felt by your young tormented souls in such a gruesomely cutting manner. The beauty of the earth, however, remained a mystery to you. Mankind can and will have heaven on earth, if only it will; the evolution of the universe, its suns, earths and living beings points this way to happiness and harmony. The feeling, the understanding for this is to be awakened. People must regain confidence in willpower and the great longing for wisdom. We need the healthy and the wise!"

**That the late Count Tolstoy, who in** recent decades has been celebrated almost like a saint, was in truth a miser and a hypocrite, and did not even remotely think of practicing the self-renunciation he preached, was pointed out by "Lehre und Wehre" several years ago. Now the "A. E. L. K." also writes: "One of the most admired among them (the pseudo-Christians), one who had supposedly unearthed pure 'primitive Christianity,' is now making a fresh stir: Count Tolstoy's flight from the world has become a **cause celfebre for the** entire press. For countless gushers this escape is something perplexing. For they have believed that Tolstoy had long since denied the world and its pleasures and lived like an anachoret, at least like a Russian peasant. Those closest to him knew otherwise. Certainly, Count Tolstoy no longer dined sumptuously or smoked heavy cigars, but lived "naturally," like other wealthy gentlemen of his age, who, after a youth full of revelry, must be sparing with their strength. But it was, after all, the life of a grand seigneur, with numerous servants, in the midst of art treasures, in a magnificent park strictly closed to the **profanum vulgus,** with a personal physician at his side, stately horses in the stables. Barefoot in peasant garb, the count stood only pose for painters and photographers. At best one can say: he was an eccentric.

and had certain quirks, like a naturopath. But to be a great prophet he lacked the power of renunciation, which he preached without practicing it himself. This nihilist of the salon cursed State and Church, befuddled and made rebellious tens of thousands by his writings; but in his immediate surroundings, where he was known, even the least peasant wanted nothing to do with the count's comedian. Originally he had the whole press, especially the Jewish Democratic press, to himself; but in recent years the 'exposing articles' about him have multiplied. Now he has fled 'into solitude', but not, like Gautama Buddha, to be nearer the Deity, but - like the 'North Poland Explorer' Cook, to escape the ravings of the Genas-led. And perhaps, he may think, he may once more succeed in deceiving the swarm, in saving the lie of this life of 80 years from being decomposed. But even if this is too harsh, if we are wrong here, it is at least the horror of this lie that has driven him away; for he himself motivates his flight with the desire to withdraw from his 'previous world of luxury', thus admitting that he has by no means lived along in renunciation. The man who sat surrounded by a bunch of physical children wrote his 'Sonata of the Cross' and hurled confusion into countless Christian families by calling childbearing a crime; and so he did in all fields. With his writings in hand, every 'dogma-free' greenhorn waved them under one's nose, every black-haired young literary man from Posen criticized Christianity. And now, when the truth gradually penetrates, the visible congregation of all chatterers will in turn cry out, 'Behold the intolerance of the Church!' See how she hounds the 80-year-old fugitive to death with her anathema!' Now he is even becoming a martyr. Yet not a hair on his head was ever harmed, and the state even protected him personally when the peasants of Yasnaya Polyana attacked him with weapons; they were worse off than anyone else, and yet Tolstoy did not help them because he 'had nothing' - his fortune, after all, was signed over to his wife." Of Tolstoy's flight from the world, shortly before his death, the same paper writes: "The great preacher of anarchism had to pay for the step out of the comfortable-luxurious home with a fatal cold, failed in the first attempt to live his teachings, and we can see nothing grandiose in this very late attempt, but only an old-fashioned self-will, such as one finds elsewhere. Tolstoy is not the first old gentleman to wander away from his own. Such a 'flight from the world' would have made quite a different impression if it had taken place 20 or 30 years ago." For then Tolstoy would still have been considered a raver and a fool, but not a common hypocrite.

F. B.

**The coming anniversary of** the English translation of the Bible completed in 1611 ("**Authorized Version**" or "**King James Version**") prompts ***The Presbyterian to give*** the following comparative value estimate: The revised version was completed in 1885, and the American Standard Revised Bible was published in 1901. These are desirable as books of reference, but they have not been able to supplant the King James Version, which remains to-day unchallenged for the beauty and purity of its diction."

D.

**That the Inquisition is still defended today by papists,** for this, according to the "D. L.", the writing of the Evangelical Federation: "The Inquisition at Work", brings the following evidence: The Boniface Booklets (1883, p. 337) write: "That one . . . . by the Inquisition those malefactors, those moral poisoners, those subversives, were still sought out, carefully traced, and a tribunal set up which had to expend all diligence to draw them out of hiding into the light and render them harmless, that will surely not be able to attract too much attention in the age of social-democratic legislation." The ecclesiastical monthly ***Analecta Ecclesiastica***, published by the Papal Household Prelate Felix Cadene and adorned with the Papal coat of arms, still said in 1895: "To the happy vigilance of the Holy Inquisition is to be attributed the religious peace and firmness of faith which adorns the Spanish people. O be blessed, you flames of the funeral pyres, by which a few subjects, and quite mischievous ones at that, have been eliminated, but each time a hundred and a hundred souls have been rescued from the abysses of heresy, and perhaps also from eternal damnation!" The Catholic professor Dr. Schrörs from Bonn summed up his judgment as follows: "The Inquisition is a great institution with a wise organism and world-saving effectiveness.

**Sillonism condemned by the Pope**. The "A. E. L. K." writes: "Within French Catholicism an association of French men had been formed more than a decade ago, which addressed itself with preference to the workers and the lowly among the people, declared religion to be the fountainhead of all actions, and thereby energetically strove for temporal welfare and the improvement of social conditions. Pope Leo XIII had often graced the young association with words of appreciation. In time it numbered thousands of members, mostly from the youth. Its organ of struggle was a small magazine, ***Le Sillon,*** founded in 1902. (The Furrow). In order to give the movement still more impetus, Marc Sangnier, the leader of the same, a former officer and faithful Catholic, created in place of the ***Sillon*** a daily paper, ***La Démocratic***, published since the middle of August of that year, which, supported by an enormous capital, was to exert still greater influence on the people. Sangnier, however, and his comrades formed their democratic principles according to the 'rights of man' of the great Revolution, and openly declared that they wished to fuse the '**droils de I'homme'** with Catholic doctrine. If hitherto the reactionary parties of France had already looked unfavourably upon the Sillonists, and made many a criticism of them, now, on this strengthening of the cause by a new body, they set everything in motion to put an end to Sillonism. And as at present the spirit of the Spanish bishops, especially that of Merry del Val, prevails in the Vatican, it may not have been too difficult for them. The Pope showed himself willing, and early in September he sent to all the French bishops a circular condemning ***Sillon.***" The Pope demands that the Sillonists place themselves under the superintendence of the bishops. F. B.

**D. Takaji, a professor at the Methodist seminary in Tokyo,** is a liberal theologian. He stated to his students, "The doctrines of original sin, incarnation, and reconciliation were not taught by Christo, but by Paulo. We Japanese need to get away from the Christianity that is

brought to us by the Europeans and Americans, dismiss everything that contends against science and the modern spirit. We want to understand Christianity in a Japanese way. We want to combine certain Confucian and Buddhist elements with Christianity. The Christianity of the future will be a mixture of Western and Eastern ideas. You young people should be it. Form a faith for yourselves!" Thus liberal theology deceives the poor Japanese, and deprives them of the very blessing which God intended should come to them from contact with Europe and America. F. B.

**Animierkneipen in Nuremberg.** The "A. G." writes: "Official reports have recently been made about the entertainment bars in Nuremberg, which provide a rather depressing insight into the conditions. The waitresses in the same do not receive the slightest wages, but are only dependent on tips, but must always dress as elegantly as possible. They have to work an average of about sixteen hours a day; they are almost never allowed any days off altogether. Their chief occupation is to encourage the guests to drink, and to drink heartily themselves. Waitresses who do not drink much in consideration of their health are simply relieved. They do not receive any remuneration for the sales of drinks they cause. However, provisions are now being included in the regulations for the operation of public houses and taverns which are intended to effectively control this malpractice. It's about time."

**Bitter truths.** About today's France, M. Hertz writes in the magazine ***La Democratic Sociale:*** "Without leadership and without security,
incapable of devoting itself to one party, wavering on all sides, liberal in the manner of the empire, that is to say, with the gestures of tyranny, lurching from right to left, the republic comes with uncanny certainty to the same point, that of dissoluteness. That is where we are at present. The same spirit of acquisitiveness, the same insatiable hunger for material pleasures, the exaggeration and at the same time the devaluation of physical pleasures, a boundless luxury, prostitution without barriers, a consuming vanity, all the brilliant froth which attracted the idle foreigners in the years 1865 to 1869, show themselves today seething on the surface of the Republic. What was temporary, scattered, volatile, and capricious under the Empire, presents itself to-day to the crude mechanism of political egalitarianism and moral degradation. All the world is accustomed to those insidious caprices which corrupt the general conscience and the conscience of individuals. Defeated for forty years, the French are day by day defeated anew. Their birth rate is falling. Their army holds its own with difficulty. Her fleet is decaying. Their routines cripple them. They still invent; but they do not apply their inventions. They are still rich; but they can only apply their fortunes in the service of foreign countries, or to the advantage of swindlers. Everything about them is consuming. They lose their rank. They live on their savings in the past, not on profits in the present. Their judgment, once so vaunted, is declining. They waste their enthusiasm on doubtful works of art, on unscrupulous men, on counterfeiters, in the fields of aesthetics, morals, and socialism."